

THE  
**Nonconformists**  
VINDICATED  
FROM THE  
**ABUSES**

Put upon them

By Mr. { **DUREL**  
and  
{ **SCRIVENER.**

Being some short Animadversions on their  
Books soon after they came forth: In two Let-  
ters to a Friend (who could not hitherto get  
them Published).

Containing some Remarques upon the Celebrated  
Conference at *Hampton-Court.*

---

*By a Country Scholar.*

---

L O N D O N

Printed for *Thomas Parkhurst*, at the Bible and  
three Crowns in *Cheapside*, 1679.

---

1900

Y12 DEC 7 1960

ABU

CDV 20

REVIEWER

...to a friend who caught him drinking  
...in two bars...

the Celebrity

[illegible]



# THE NONCONFORMISTS

Vindicated, &c.

S P N,

**T**Hough I have of late wholly addicted my self to the Study of Practical Theology, and spent all that time I could redeem from my necessary occasions, in Reading such Authors as make it their business to declare unto us the essentials of Christianity; yet it hath been some delight to me, from time to time, by your Letters, to understand what Books have been Printed about those (comparatively) Petit controversies that have of late years so miserably divided our British Churches. I heartily wish, you had still continued only to be my Intelligencer, then I had been at liberty, either not to send for the Authors you mentioned, or else when I had sent for them, to lay them aside as soon I had enough of them: but you were ambitious to be my Benefactor, and therefore lately sent me at your own cost Mr. Durrells two Eristical Volumes, conjuring me, by all our friendship, to read them over, and to return you my thoughts

of them : and though I have again and again importuned you to excuse me from so unwelcome an employment, yet will you take no denial; wherefore that I may not seem finally obstinate, I do, herewith, send you some Animadversions, the fruit of a few leisure hours; in reading whereof, if you either encrease the itch of disputation, or be forced to abate of the esteem you as yet have of your Author, you know where to lay the blame. I assure you, I envy not unto him the Ecclesiastical dignities and benefices he enjoys : but I think he was as unmeet a person, as any could have been pitched on, to undertake the Cause of our Church, against the Nonconforming Ministers : for the grounds of this so severe censure, I refer you to what follows, and at present shall only lay before you three or four necessary qualifications of him that would plead for conformity with any success, or credit to our Church.

1. He had need to be free from all suspicion of ambition, and of that, which the Apostle calls, *the root of all evil*; else his adversaries will say, that in his pleadings for the Church, he seeks not *her*, but *hers*. The Writings of Mr. *Hooker*, Mr. *Sprint*, Dr. *Burges*, as they are in themselves sober, and learned, so they are by all, or most, read without any prejudice : because they contented themselves with such ordinary preferments, as they either had before they had written, or might have expected though they had never written for Ceremonies. Nay Dr. *Burges* professeth, *that he lost more by conforming, than any did by not conforming*, (by the way, whereas Dr. *Heylin* saith *Hist. of Presby.*

*Presby.* Pag. 327. That King James occasioned this Doctors preferring to the Rectory of Colshill in Warwickshire: the Reader may take notice that he was never Rector of Colshill, but of Sutton Goldfield, unto which the King occasioned not his preferment, for the presentation was given him without his seeking, by Mr. Shilton, after it had been first refused by Dr. Cherwind; I therefore doubt not but he did write for the lawfulness of Subscription, out of conscience, and that he would have continued in that opinion, though Authority had frowned upon it.

I dare not say so much concerning all that were, or would have been, more highly dignified. The first *English* man that grated hard upon the *Presbyterian* Government in the Latin tongue, was Dr. Matthew Sutcliffe, Dean of Exeter, in a Book entituled *de verâ, Catholicâ & Christianâ Ecclesiâ*, this very man, whether discontented, because his Book against Mr. Mountague was suppressed; or angry that he missed some preferment he aimed at, or for some other reasons we know not of, before his death, professed his hearty sorrow that he had written so much against *Presbytery* and for the power of the domineering Prelates, as may be seen in the *Fus divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici*. Who professed a greater zeal for Hierarchy than Patrick Adamson? But Hierarchy not being able to pay its quarters in the worlds own coin, how poorly did he Recant all his actings for it? Confessing *Presbyteries* to be an ordinance of Christ, and craving Gods mercy, that he had called them a foolish invention; bewailing his pride and covetousness, that had put

him upon undertaking the office of an Archbishop, at that wherewith justly the sincere professors of the word have found fault, and condemned as impertinent to the office of a sincere pastor of Gods word, ingaging also that if he had health, he would write a confutation of Sutcliffes Book. All which, and much more, is to be found in the Records of the Scottish Nation.

2. He that would, with any advantage to the Church, undertake to confute Nonconformists, must be one that hath seen and well considered, either all, or the chiefest of their Books; and well knows the Histories of the times in which they were written. Else, first he may commit such foul mistakes in Chronology, as will render him ridiculous and contemptible to all his Readers. Can the most mortified Presbyterian chuse but laugh, when he finds in Dr. Heylins History of Presbyterians, Pag. 264, that about 1570. Mr. Carthwrights grace for Doctor was denied him, by the major part of the University; which so displeased him, and his adherents, that, from that time, the degrees of Doctors, Batchelors, and Masters, were esteemed unlawful, and those that tooke them reckoned for the limbs of Antichrist, as appears by the Genevian notes on the Revelations. How can it appear from the Geneva notes, that from the time of denying Mr. Carthwrights grace, degrees were accounted unlawful? when every one knows, that many years before the denial of that grace, those notes had been both made, and published, perhaps by such as never saw or heard of Mr. Carthwright: Nor is that less ridiculous which occurs, Pag. 294. where  
mention

mention being made of a Pamphlet written by *Stubbes* of *Lincolns-Inne*, it is said, that *Stubbes* had married one of *Mr. Carthwrights* Sisters, and therefore may be thought to have done nothing without his privity. *Mr. Carthwright* indeed married one of *Mr. Stubbes* his Sisters, but that *Mr. Stubbes* married one of his Sisters is a falshood, and if it were supposed to be a truth, what ground is that, why a man should think that *Stubbes* did nothing without his privity? Do all writers make their Brothers-in-law privy to their designs? I acknowledge that *Thuanus* saith it was found out that *Mr. Carthwright* instigated him to write the *Libel*; but *Thuanus* is not to be relied on in matters relating to the *English Puritans*, because in such, he follows one who was their bitter adversary; as also because *Thuanus* himself was too too Antipuritanical, perfectly in Religion of the same mind with *Cassander* and *Baldwin*, whose Character need not be given. Doubtless had there been either clear proof, or vehement suspicion, that *Mr. Carthwright* was accessory to the compiling of the *gaping Gulph*, he had not escaped some signal token of the Queens displeasure; for her Majesty was so highly incensed against the Author, Printer, and Publisten of it, that nothing less would satisfie her, than arraignment of them upon the Statute of *Philip and Mary*, against the Authors and Dispersers of seditious writings; and because some of her chief Lawyers were of opinion, That that law was but temporary, and of no force in her reign, she imprisoneth one of them, and turns another out of his place, and prevailed so far, that both *Stubbes*,

and *Page* (who dispersed the Copies) had sentence passed upon them, to lose their right hands : which accordingly were cut off in the market-place of *Westminster*, with a Butchers knife and a Mallet; but it is observed by more than one of our Historians, that when *Stubbes* his right hand was cut off, he did pull off his Hat with his left hand, and cry out, *God save the Queen*: and the people by a general silence gave their Testimony, that the punishment was too severe. Nor did the Queen her self take much pleasure in reflecting on this penalty, but rather when the heat of passion was over, received *Stubbes* into some degree of favour, as is probable from the imployment that he had under *Peregrine Lord Willoughby*, sent by the Queen with four thousand Soldiers to assist the King of *Navar*, in which imployment he ended his days, but by a natural death.

Secondly, if our Writers for Conformity know not the State of the controversies, and the times, in which they were managed, they will go near to contradict one another; and will it not make the *Nonconformists* good sport, to see their adversaries at dissension among themselves? Could Mr. *Durells English Book* have been more effectually confuted by any writing, than by Dr. *Heylins History of Presbyterians*? Dr. *Stradling* licenseth a Book tending to prove that the *Presbyterians* in *England* are a singular sort of men, as contrary to the *Presbyterians* beyond the Seas, as to their own Bishops at home; the Vicechancellor of *Oxford* licenseth a Book designed to prove that all *Presbyterians*, all the reformed Churches over, are all acted

acted by one spirit, equally prone to sedition and schisme, alike bent to destroy all Kingdoms and Churches into which they are received. Will not the *Presbyterians* say *Aha! so would we have it?* will they not even bless themselves in these contradictions of their adversaries? Dr. *Haylin* saith, *Lib. 7. Pag. 275.* "*Whig* gave *Carthwrights* admonition, in a Book entituled, *An answer to the Admonition. Carthwright* sets out a reply in the year following, and *Whig* presently rejoyns in defence of his Answer; against which *Carthwright* never stirred, but left him Master of the field, possess of all the signs of an absolute Victory. But Sir *George Paul* saith, "*Mr. Carthwright* (glorying be-like to have the last word) published a second reply, fraught with no other stuff than had been before refuted, from answering of which *Whig* was dissuaded. Will not such sweet concord as this, make delicate Musick in the ears of the *Nonconformists*? Especially considering that the Letter of *Whitaker* mentioned by the Doctor, is pretended by the Knight to be one of the main inducements moving *Whig* not to rejoyn to the second reply. And let me admonish the *Conformists* not much to glory in *Whitakers* letter, reflecting so much disgrace on *Carthwrights* Book, seeing *Whitaker* was then,

1. Under thirty years of age.
2. Never dreamed that his Letter should be made publick.
3. Afterwards married the Widow of *Dudley Fennor*.
4. In those writings which were the product and issue of his more mature judgment and study, layeth down such principles as the *Nonconformists* think their

their conclusions do naturally and lineally descend from. 3. Died in over-straining his diligence to suppress the *Pelagian* notions of *Peter Baro*, so much now-adays applauded and admired. Certainly if they are to be accounted Victors who keep the field last, the *Nonconformists* have at least as many Victors as the *Conformists*, though we should grant that *Whigists* had the last word of *Cartwright*, which yet is not to be granted. But doth not Mr. Fuller say in his Ecclesiastical History, he had? Answer, He doth; but I have been assured, that being before Oliver's triers for a living, he ingenuously acknowledged his error, and promised to certify it, if ever his Book came to a second Edition, which I therefore give notice of, that it may proceed no further, and that Mr. Isaac Walton, who is still alive, and hath fallen into the same mistake in his life of Mr. Hooker, Pag. 85. may disabuse his Reader. The which if he will vouchsafe to do, we shall have encouragement to try, whether we cannot acquaint him with some more of his mistakes, and misadventures. In the mean time I should be glad to understand, what assurance can be given us, that Bishop Jewel ever used such words concerning *Cartwright* as those mentioned by Dr. Heylin. Lib. 7. Pag. 274. and elsewhere, viz. *Stultitia nata est in corde pueri sed virga disciplina fugabit eam*: for it seems improbable, that so grave a Prelate, should give so unhandsome a character of a very learned man, concerning whom he could make no estimation, but by a few scattered papers, designed for a Book that saw not the light till Jewel was entred into the chambers of Darknells.

All



All that I can see any ground to acknowledg, at present, is but this, that *Jewel* both in a Sermon at *Paul's*, and in a conference with some Brethren, had declared himself to be an approver of the *Eng-lish* ceremonies; and that being ready to leave the world, he declared that what he uttered in his Sermon, and conference, was designed neither to please any mortal, nor to embitter or trouble any party that thought otherwise than himself; but that neither party might prejudice the other, and that the love of God by the Holy spirit which is given to us, might be poured forth in the hearts of brethren. See his life written by the Nonconforming Dr. *Hampred*. Pag. 255. *edit. Lond. an. 1573.* And if Dr. *Heylins* friends will please to consult, Pag. 275. They shall find *Jewel* died September 23. about three in the afternoon, not as the Doctor affirms, *Lib. 6. Pag. 270.* September the 22. And then they may also consider whether he hath not erred in dating *Zanchies* Letter to *Queen Elizabeth*, September the second; for in my edition of *Zanchies* Letters put forth by his Heirs at *Hannove* 1606. it bears date the tenth of September, 1571. These are small matters, it will be said; I confess they be; but if men will write Histories, they ought to be very exact, and publish nothing that need fear the severest examination.

Let me be excused if I here adventure to give two more instances, one of Dr. *Heylins* imaginary Victories; the other of his contrariety to other writers whom he sometimes quotes with applause. *Lib. 8. Pag. 283.* He acquaints us that Dr. *Banproft* made a most excellent and judicious Sermon (let that

that pass) he gives us the heads of that Sermon, saying, pag. 284, *That they were all proved with such evidence of demonstration, such great variety of Learning, and Strength of arguments, that none of all that party could be found to take arms against them in defence either of their lewd doctrine, or more scandalous Uses.* All this with bitterness and malice more than enough; but with no regard to truth: for Dr. *John Reynolds* at the desire of Sir *Francis Knowles*, did attaque that so much applauded Sermon of Feb. 9th. at St. Pauls Cross, and pulled down two of the main pillars, viz. *The superiority which Bishops have among us over their Clergy, is Gods own ordinance.* 2. *Jerome and Calvin confess that Bishops have had superiority ever since the times of St. Mark the Evangelist.* The Letter of Dr. *Reynolds* in which he doth this, is in many mens hands, and the Historian doubtless had, if not seen, yet heard of it, and therefore was inexcusable in representing Dr. *Bancroft* to be so formidable an adversary, that none durst look him in the face. Let those who account Dr. *Bancrofts* Sermon unanswerable, reply to Dr. *Reynolds* his Letter, and if it be thought that Dr. *Reynolds* hath not refuted all the passages of the Sermon, let us know what the particulars be that still remain unanswered, and yet need an answer, and if after such notice given, such terror seize on *Presbyterians* that none dare appear, let the Sermon then be carried about in triumph; till then I hope it will be no presumption to say, that Dr. *Reynolds* as well understood the judgment of the Fathers, concerning Episcopacy, as Dr. *Bancroft*.

The

The instance of his contradicting others, shall be part of the story concerning the infamous separatist *Browne*: Sir *George Paul* in the life of Archbishop *Whig*, Pag. 53, acquaints us, that *Brown* in the Archbishops time was changed from his fancies, and after obtained a benefice called *Achurch* in Northamptonshire where he became a painful Preacher. But Dr. *Heylin*, Lib. 7. Pag. 297. tells us, he was prevailed with to accept a place, *Achurch* in Northamptonshire, beneficed with cure of Souls; a benefice of good value, which might tempt him to it the rather, in regard that he was excused as well from Preaching as from performing any other part of the publick Ministry. Certainly, if he became a painful Preacher, there was no need of excusing him from Preaching.

But who is in the truth? I think neither the Knight nor the Doctor; painful Preacher to be sure *Brown* never was, after his presentation to *Achurch*; nor is it probable that he was excused from Preaching, any more than from living quietly with his Wife. Bishops have strained their power very high, but I am unwilling to believe that any Prelate since our Reformation would institute a man, healthful and able to Preach, into a cure of Souls, and yet excuse him from all parts of the publick Ministry.

Nay, thirdly, If men take the field against the *Nonconformists* before they have sufficiently tried their strength, they may chance to be mastered by these arguments they imagined themselves able to master; and so even face about in the day of battel, fighting against those from whom they received their

their first pay. Mr. *Henry Feants* had never seen a *Nonconformist* using his own weapon, and therefore thought him contemptible, and adventured to defie him in a Printed Treatise upon *1 Theſ. 5. 22.* But when he came to Read the very Books of the *Nonconformists* themselves, he found himself no longer able to withstand the dint of their arguments, but went over to them, and died their Convert, as all know who were his Neighbour Ministers: some *Papists* by reading Protestant Books, with an intent to confute them, have been converted by them; and therefore the *Grandees* in the *Roman Church*, will not give leave to one of a thousand, to Read all manner of Books; nay in some places they will scarcely permit *Bellarmines* works to be commonly sold, lest that little which is in them of *Calvin* should putge all *Catholicism* out of their young Students. I wish the Prelates of our Church would consider how far the prudence of *Papacy* is imitable; certainly every one who is willing to have a Prebendship from them, is not able to stand under the weight and burden that is laid upon *Episcopacy*. If our Church must be vindicated, let it be vindicated by another *Hooker*, made up of learning and modesty; as for Mr. *Duret*, if he have got a *lask*, and must needs ease himself in the Press, it may be worth consideration, whether he be not fit to succeed to *Tom. Nash*, whose scoffing Pen was not altogether useless in Queen *Elizabeths* days.

I had almost added, that he who will to purpose defend our Church, must not be a *Jersey man*; not only, because such a one can scarce be sup-

posed

posed fully to know the intrigues of our differences; but also because it can scarce be thought, that he should be conscientiously a friend to our Hierarchy: for we are not now to be told, that the *Episcopal* Government settled here in *England*, could not get into *Jersey*, but by wile, if not force. *Jersey*, *Guernsey*, &c. are the only remainders of the Crown of *England* in the Dukedom of *Normandy*, and in former times belonged to the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Constance*, but were governed immediately by a subordinate Officer mixt of a Chancellor and Archdeacon; they entertained the Reformed Religion in King *Edward*'s time, and some of their Inhabitants suffered for it in the time of Queen *Mary*; Queen *Elizabeth*'s reignings, by the help of some *French* Ministers, the generality were again brought to seek after Reformation; but withall Petition the Queen for an allowance of the *Presbyterian* Discipline, Anno 1563, and Anno 1569, obtain it for all, or some part of the Islands: on which allowance they adventure to put it in execution, and hold a Synod in the Isle of *Guernsey*, Sep. 2. 1567. Nor do I find that they had any considerable disturbance in it, till Sir *John Peiron* was made their Governour, who with the Kings Attorney protested against that choice of Mr. *Brevin*, which was made by the Colloquy, upon the decease of the Curate of *St. Johns*: the ground of the Protestation was the prejudicialness of such Elections to the Rights and Profits of the King, deprived thereby of *Parsonages*, and *first Fruits*. This Protestation, though overruled for a season, wrought so effectually, that about 1615, the

the Governour presented one Mr. *Messering* to the Parish of *St. Peters*; this *Messering* had been ordained Priest by Dr. *Bridges* Bishop of *Oxford*, but his presentation was so offensive to the Colloquy, that Governour and Ministers appear before King *James*, referring the whole concernment to his Majesties final Judgment; and the Ministers for ought I find, had continued in *Statu quo*, had they been unanimous; but Monsieur *De la Place* being brought into a golden dream, that if a Dean were again established in the *Isle*, he, and no other should be the man, betrayed his brethren, and violated the Oath he had before taken, so as it was at length ordered by the Council of *England*, That an Officer invested with the authority of the ancient Dean, should again be established in the *Isle* of *Jersey*, and that the Bishop of *Winchester* should by Commission under his seal give authority unto the said Dean, to exercise Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in the said *Isle*: but not Monsieur *Place*, but Mr. *Baudinel*, an *Italian*, is put into the Deanery; which Mr. *Places* high stomach not digesting, he retires into *Guernsey*, breathing out nothing but disgrace to the *English Liturgy*, and the Change of Government made in *Jersey*, by his own Treachery. The sum of all is: The Islanders of *Jersey* had the *English Liturgy* translated into their own Language in the reign of King *Edward the sixth*; in Queen *Elizabeths* reign, they forsook it, ascribed the *Presbyterial discipline*, and by Oath bound themselves to keep and observe it. The Episcopal Government was obtruded upon them, through the perjury of an Ambitious Minister who declaimed against it as soon as he saw he could

not

not serve his own ends by it. Doth any Law oblige us to believe that any Natives of this Isle heartily embrace it? I think it will be no uncharitableness to say——*Timeo Danaos, & dona ferentes.*

A fourth qualification required in him that will go a warfare for our Church, is a good knowledge of all the rules and forms of Argumentation; he that wants such knowledge, will no more be able to manage the Churches Arguments, than *David* was to use *Saul's* Armor; nay, he will be a stumbling-block and stone of offence to our young students. When *Dr. Heylin's Certamen Epistolare* came abroad, I had spent Three years and no more at *Cambridg*; yet I must needs buy the Book, because the Author was famed for his Geography, and had been represented to me as a very living Library; thought I,

*Si pergamina dextra*

*Defendi possent, certe hac defensa videtur.*

But reading his Answer to *Mr. Baxter*, I found my self quite frustrated in my expectation; for whereas *Mr. Baxter* had made a conditional Syllogism, and instead of assuming the words of the antecedent at large, had used an allowed brevity, But the antecedent is true: The Dr. tells him Page 80. That it was a strange piece of news to him, to read any one making use of that brief form of conditional Syllogism. This startled me, for I was sure that almost every System of Logick, that fell into the mention of conditional Syllogisms, not only allowed, but commended it to us, for brevity

sake, after a conditional *major* to proceed thus,  
*But the Antecedent is true, Ergo, so is the Consequent*; or, *but the Consequent is false, Ergo, so is the Antecedent*: I was as sure that those Schoolmen (in whose Logicks and Metaphysicks I had wasted too much time) did usually so argue, and I had read that long before them, the Stoicks were much pleased with this form of Argumentation, and called it *Anhypotheton*; how then (said I within my self) comes it to pass, that an ancient Dr. in Divinity, who hath combated not only *Puritans*, but also Bishops and Heads of Houses, and sometimes nibbles at *Belarmine* himself, should upon the reading of such a Syllogism fall into such a fit of admiration? What Answer I gave my self, is not material; but I resolved to lay aside my opinion of the Doctors abilities; but rather to hope that he would make known some mystery that was hid from *Duncan, Burgesdicinus, Isenderne, &c.* till I came to his 81 Page, where I met with these words, *The Antecedent in all Hypothetical propositions being conditional, imperfect, and of no full sense, cannot be said to be either true or false.* When I had read them, I then concluded the Dr. was void of all rational learning, and perhaps did not know what *hypothetical* signified; for certainly every hypothetical Proposition is a compound Proposition; and if it be compound, it must consist of Two Propositions, and one of those Propositions must needs be the Antecedent: Now if the Antecedent be a Proposition, it must needs be either true or false. I know that sometimes the Antecedent, as well as the Consequent, is not formally



formally a Proposition; but it's evermore, at least virtually a Proposition; and therefore may be said to be true or false; if it could not, why do our Logicks so carefully tell us, that we must not estimate the verity or falsity of a conditional, from the verity or falsity of its parts, but from the true or false connexion that is betwixt them? It were perfectly needless to tell us, that we are not to estimate the verity of a conditional, from the verity of the Antecedent, if the Antecedent neither can be said to be true nor false. Besides, if there may be affirmation and negation in the Antecedent, then may the Antecedent be either true or false; but there may be affirmation or negation in the Antecedent, *Ergo*. The *minor* I prove from the common rule given for the right making of those conditional Syllogisms, in which the *major* only is Hypothetical; the Rule is, That we must either proceed from the position of the Antecedent, to the position of the Consequent; or from the destruction of the Consequent to the destruction of the Antecedent; if we proceed not thus, we may from true premises infer a false conclusion: Now what is it to put *ponere* the Antecedent? Why, it is to bring it into the *minor*, with the same quality it had in the *major*; That is, if it were affirmative in the *major*, it must be affirmative in the *minor*; if negative in the *major*, then negative in the *minor*: Ay, but whatever dull Logicians prate, is not the Antecedent in every Hypothetical, conditional, imperfect? *Ans.* Certainly it is not; for the [*if*] which is commonly prefixed to the Antecedent, is no part of the Antecedent;

dent; but it is the *copula* that converteth the Antecedent and the Consequent, just as the Verb [*is*] in a Categorical, coupleth the subject and predicate. Let this be the example, *if the Sun shineth, it is day*; here be two propositions, *the Sun shineth, it is day*, both are joined into one compound proposition by the Conjunction *if*; and the plain meaning is, if the first proposition be true, the second is also. No less ignorance doth the Dr. bewray, when he saith, *In every hypothetical Syllogism, the major proposition consisteth of two parts, or branches, whereof one is called the Antecedent, the other the consequent*: For I can make him an Hundred Hypothetical Syllogisms, in which the *minor* only and conclusion shall be Hypothetical, and the *major* a plain Categorical. It may be Mr. D. will say, this shakes not his Corn; and indeed it doth not: but he also might have done well, before he dabled in the Printers Ink, to read over some Compendiums; then would he have amended the Title of above Fifty Pages in his Book, not writing *The Conformity of the Reformed Churches, with the Reformed Church of England*; for this Enunciation, *There is a conformity betwixt the Reformed Churches, and the Reformed Church of England in the things of present controversy*, cannot be proved, but by an Induction, shewing, that all, or the most, or the most famous Reformed Churches, agree with the Church of England in all, or most, or the chiefest of those matters the present Nonconformists scruple. Hath he shewed this? he doth as good as confess he hath not; for Page 53. Sect. 63. giving us the *summa totalis* of his atchievements,

he

he plainly says, it amounts but to this much, *There is hardly one of the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England that is not used in some one Reformed Church or other.* Which suppose he had proved (as he hath not) he is, many Stages off from the conclusion he propounded to infer; if he deem he is not, let him write a Book to prove that the Language of the *Matthuses* is conformable to the *English* Language, because there is some one word in which both languages do agree, and see whether he will not be laughed at to purpose.

But I will free my mind from all prejudices that may be taken against Mr. D. on the account of his Country; nor will I create him any odium from the high *elogiums* he bestows on the Earl of *Clarendon*, sentenced by King and Parliament to perpetual banishment, as unworthy to live in *England*, (though I wonder Mr. D. doth no where bewail his sin or misery in heaping so many praises on him who deserved so few.) 'Tis not the man, but his Book I am to undertake, and in it I will shew,

1. Where there is a real controversy betwixt *Episcoparians* and *Presbyterians*, he quite mistakes it.

2. That he takes a great deal of pains to prove that which was never questioned by any sober man among us.

3. That he defiles his Paper with many untruths and falsehoods.

4. That he hath let fall not a few passages which are manifestly prejudicial and destructive

to the Church of *England*, as it is now established.

As to the real controversies now on foot, the principal of them may be reduced to three general Heads, *Episcopacy, Liturgy, Ceremonies.*

The *Presbyterians* say, that if they conform, they must receive *Episcopacy* as an order by Divine Law, superior to *Presbytery*, and invested with sole power of order and jurisdiction: Search Mr. *Dwells* Book with Candles, and if there be in it any one Line tending to prove that either there is any such *Episcopacy* in any one reformed Church, or that any one Reformed Church, if her judgment were asked, would approve such an *Episcopacy*, and I will confess myself mistaken. He reckoneth himself most secure of the *Lutheran* Churches, and among the *Lutherans*, especially of such as are governed by a Monarchy, particularly he tells us, That in *Denmark* they have *Bishops*, and *Arch-bishops*, ~~name and thing~~, Page 5. How much he is mistaken in this, will soon appear, if we consult the History of the Reformation of that Kingdom. About the year 1537, *Bugenhagen* is sent for into *Denmark*, where the Twelfth of *August*, he performed all the Ecclesiastical part of the Kings Coronation; and Fourteen days after that Coronation, he ordained Seven Superintendents, to be keepers and executors of all Ecclesiastical Ordination, and to do the office of *Bishops*: Now I ask, seeing *Bugenhagen* was but a *Presbyter*, whether he put the Superintendents into an order higher than his own? if he did, who gave him an authority so to do? If he did not, then are there no

*Bishops*

Bishops properly so called in *Denmark*. *Melchior Adam*, who relates this of *Bugenbagen*, relates also in the life of *Luther*, that he, calling Three other *Presbyters* to join with him in laying on of hands, ordained *Nicholas Amdorf* Bishop, repudiating one chosen by the Colledg of Canons, and very dear to the Emperor; That is, he ordained one by the name of a Bishop, but he was only a *Presbyter*, and could not think himself to be of an higher Order, being ordained by *Luther* that was but a meer *Presbyter*.

*Gerhard* acquaints us, That the *Papists*, or at least some of them, did proclaim the Ordinations in their Churches to be void and null, because performed by *Luther* who was no Bishop; but that ever any *Lutheran* thought their Ordinations less valid on that account, will never be proved. I have read *Hunnium* his Demonstration of the *Lutheran* Ministry; and though he were himself a Superintendent, yet he so little magnifies his Office, that he sticks not to affirm, That he who ordains, ordains only as the Officer of the Church; and that any one whatever that should by the Church be set so ordain, would ordain as validly as a Bishop doth. And, if it will do Mr. D. any kindness, I can, and will on his desire, direct him to a *Lutheran*, who calls us *Anglos Papizantes*, for straining Episcopacy so high, and appropriating Ordination to that Order: *Chemnitius* had occasion to examine the Anathematizing Decrees of the Conventicle of *Trent*; one of them was, If any one shall say that a Bishop is not superior to a *Presbyter*, let him be *Anathema*. There he was necessitated to shew the

judgment of the *Lutheran* Churches, and yet he there delivereth nothing, but what the English-*Presbyterians* can subscribe to; and though the incomparable *Philip Melancthon* was blamed for giving more to Bishops than was meet; yet he hath not given more to them, than what the English Nonconformists are ready to give them.

Thus of the *Lutheran* Churches. It will not be so difficult for me to find out the judgment of the Churches more strictly called Reformed, because I shall find the most famous of them, except the *Gallican*, meeting together at the Synod of *Dort*. Of the *Gallican* therefore by themselves; and I say, that the Writers of those Churches have done more against our English Hierarchy, than the Writers of any, or all Reformed Churches besides. For,

1. Some of them have made it their business to overthrow the credit of *Ignatius* his Epistles, from which, more than from any writing whatever, our Hierarchy doth strengthen it self. Did not *Salmasius* and *Blondell* strain their diligence, to prove that even the most correct Copy of *Ignatius* is spurious? And when our learned *Hammond* had taken some pains to vindicate the Epistles, *Maresius* quarrels with *Blondell*, because he did not presently (all other business laid aside) take the Doctor to task, and maintain against him the Apology he had made for St. *Hieroms* opinion; yet *Dally* tells us, that *Blondell* had intended to answer for himself, had he not been prevented by death. Because death did prevent him, therefore his friend Monsieur *Dally* hath done that work for him; and it is said,

said, that Dr. Pierſon hath news ſent him, That if he think meet to reply upon *Dally*, he ſhall not long want a rejoinder.

2. Thoſe that have defended our Engliſh Hierarchy, have not been more uncivilly dealt with by any, than by learned *French* men. I will not now (becauſe indeed I am aſhamed) tell what language *Danani* gave *Saravia*, becauſe of his Book *De diverſis Miniſtrorum gradibus*. *Salmaſius* imagining himſelf diſparaged by a word never intended as a diſparagement, could not forbear calling Dr. *Hammond* Knave. *Mareſius* (in the firſt queſtion he handleth againſt Dr. *Prideaux*) not ſo bluntly, but more virulently, tells us, That Dr. *Hammond* had proceeded to ſuch a degree of fury, as that he did profeſſedly propugne the cauſe of the Pope; not content to ſpit in a ſingle Doctors face, he thus cenſures all our Biſhops, *Melius ſua vox conſuluiſſent Præſules Anglicani, ſi & moderatius in ea egiſſent, & illam cum reliquis Proteſtantibus maluiſſent agnoſcere jure eccleſiaſtici, quam mordicus aſſerere jure Divini. Nam ut arcus nimia intenſione frangitur, ſic & illi nimium intendentes ſuam authoritatem, & dignitatem ea penitus exciderunt, inſtar Cameli in fabula, qui quod cornua affectaſſet, etiam auribus multatus fuit, page 68. And then page 70, ſpeaking of ſome miſchiefs that had befallen the Biſhops, he thus expreſſeth himſelf, Ipſimet Præſules Angli, fuiſſent ea declinaturi, ſi fortunam ſuam magis reverenter habuiſſent, neq; ex parte collimaſſent ad Papiſmi reſtitutionem, jure poſtliminii, licet majorem aut ſaltem meliorem partem eorum hac iniquitatis myſteria latuerint. Quare nobis*

nobis eminus hanc catastrophem spectantibus; id salum dicendum restat, domine justus es, & iusta iudicia tua. And then page 111, speaking of our Bishops arrogating to themselves temporal jurisdiction, he dreads not to let fall these Lines; *Hæc defensio Jurisdictionis temporalis pro Ecclesia Ministris portio aliqua est, illius fermenti Papistici, quo Hierarchie Anglicanæ massa, paulatim se infici passa fuit, dum magis ambit typhum sæculi, ut loquar cum patribus Africanis, quam humilitatem crucis modisatur: potuissent forte Episcopi Anglicani suam inopem & sua rura retinuisse, nisi voluissent penitus suum Episcopatum ad modulum Romanum componere.*

3. But above all, let that be considered which is laid down by Peter Moulins in his Letter to the Bishop of Winchester, Where to excuse himself for not making the difference betwixt Bishops and Presbyters to be of Divine appointment, he pleads, that if he had laid the difference on that foundation, the French Churches would have silenced him.

Will the French Churches silence him that should assert the *jus Divinum* of Episcopacy? and yet will Mr. Durell go about to persuade us, that they do not condemn our English Hierarchy, which asserts it self to be Divine, and cares not for being at all, if it be not such? The Two Archbishops in Dr. Bastwick's Case, did protest even in open Court, That if they could not prove their Episcopal Jurisdiction and Function, which they claimed and exercised over other Ministers, and themselves as they were Bishops, to be superior in power, dignity, and degree to other Ministers, *Jure Divino*, they



they would forthwith cast away their *Rockets* off their backs, lay down their *Bishopricks* at his Majesty's feet, and not continue one hour longer *Bishops*. If therefore Mr. D. can bring any eminent *French* Divines that found *Episcopacy*, as distinct from, and superior to, *Presbytery*, on any Divine Law, he will do something to stop the mouths of Non-conformists; but such he will never be able to bring, unless he first cause the Golden Ball to run before them, or fill them with that which blindeth the eyes of the wise. Certain I am, that Dr. Andrew Rivet, in his *Summa Controver. Second Tract. 22. Quest.* thus states the question: *We dispute not whether Bishops be, de facto, above Presbyters; but whether they be so, de jure; nor is the question of Humane, but Divine Law: We deny that Bishops by Divine Law have any pre-eminence above Presbyters.* This is the more considerable, because it is dedicated to four great Protestant Divines, Peter Moulin, William Rivet, John Maximilian Langle, Samuel Bochart; and because it is again repeated in Rivet's Writings against Grotius. When some Ministers were by the Assembly employed to get foreign Divines, by some Letters, to signify their minds in the controversy of our *Episcopacy*; among others, the said Ministers went to this Dr. Rivet, then at the *Hague*, desiring him, that he would be pleased to signify his mind: He excused himself from Writing, because of his relation to — but took down one of his Books, in which he denied the Divine Right of *Episcopacy*; declaring, That was his judgment, which he would never deny. This I had from the mouth of a  
very

very Reverend person still alive, who was one employed to discourse him.

But I have a later testimony; when the *Scots* went to *Breda* to treat with their King, *Dr. River* put a Preface to *Bodinus* his Comment on the *Ephesians*, commending it to the World; and I am sure in that, the English Hierarchy is sufficiently beaten down. I have said all that for the present I intend to say about the *French* Churches; of other Reformed Churches I may speak more briefly, because most of them met together in a Synod at *Dort*, to put an end to the differences about the five points: What was done in that Synod? Why, saith Mr. *Mountague* in his *Appeal*, page 70, *In it, and in other Dutch Synods, the Discipline of the Church of England is held unlawful.* At this Mr. *Durell* had need to bestir himself; for either Mr. *Mountague*, or he will be found to be a Liar: I shall not determine who is to blame; but by reading the Acts of that Synod, I do find, that Session 144, notice was given, That it was the will of the States, that the Confession of Faith of the *Belgick* Churches, should be read and examined by the Synod, the *Exteri* being also present. The One and thirtieth Article of that Confession, when it comes to speak particularly of the Ministers of the Word, saith, *That in what place soever they be, they have the same power and authority, as being all the Ministers of Christ, the only Universal Bishop, and only Head of the Church.* These words would not down with our *British* Divines, because directly opposite to government by Archbishops and Bishops in *England*: Whereupon the

the Lord Bishop of Landaff, in his own name, and the name of his Brethren, made open protestation, That whereas in the Confession there was inserted a strange conceit of the Parity of Ministers to be instituted by Christ, he declared his own and his brethrens utter dissent in that point. Now hence, I thus argue, either the words in that Article do condemn our Government in England, or they do not; if they do not, why did our British Divines concern themselves to make protestation, open protestation against them? If they did, then all at once down falls the one half of Mr. Durell's Book: For then the Holland Churches in their very Confession of Faith condemn the Discipline of the Church of England; and if the Holland Churches do so, other Churches do so also: For by the Divines of no other Church besides the English, was any dislike shewn to those words, asserting the parity of all Ministers. As for the Deputies of the Gallo-Belgick Churches, they declared, That the French Churches, though not there present, had before, in a National Synod held in the City of Vurriack 1583, declared solemnly, *their approbation, not only of the Doctrine, but also of the Discipline of their Holland Brethren*: No wonder they so readily consented, for an Egg is not more like to an Egg, than is the Gallican Confession to the Belgick, in the matters of Ministers and Discipline; both of them are a note above the *Ela* of many, who have the ill hap to be called *Presbyterians*, and lose their livings here in England: both say, *That this is one part of the Polity taught in the word, that there should be in the Church of Christ, Pastors, Elders,*

*Elders, Deacons.* To this it is like that Mr. Durell himself hath subscribed; for he somewhere tells us, That he had for some years a place among the *French Protestants*; and he tells us, page 54, *That no man is to be ordained a Minister, or admitted to any other office in the said Churches, but he must subscribe, besides the publick Confession of their Faith, the Canons and Constitutions agreed on at Paris, commonly known by the name of their Discipline.* Now if a man should go to him, and ask him whether he believes it to be any piece of Christs Polity, that there should be in his Church Elders, Ruling-Elders, distinct from Preaching Elders or Pastors, he would either say *no*, or say *nothing*. Why did he with his hand subscribe to that which he did not with his heart believe? Perhaps he is a *Latitudinarian*, or hath a Sluce in his Conscience. But the simple Nonconformists in *England* dare not say they assent to all, and every thing, if there be something unto which they do not unfeignedly assent; they say, they can promise not publickly to contradict any thing delivered in the Liturgy or Book of Ordination; and some who are beneficed and dignified, tell them, they mean no more, by professing assent and consent. But Nonconformists cannot bring themselves to imagine, that form of words imports no more. What a misery it is, that so many Families should be ruined for want of a distinguishing faculty! *Episcopus* hath prescribed a Receipt, which if they can but take, may cure them of their scrupulosity; (but let them fear lest it purge them of their Conscience also: ) For thus he, *What if the Magistrate re-*  
quire

quir  
opin  
is  
opin  
ceiv  
a fa  
for  
N  
Pen  
yet  
not  
late  
told  
tron  
them  
spir  
liber  
Lon  
been  
com  
so  
mit  
ther  
tur  
any  
hat  
fuff  
M  
wa  
nob  
cot  
bei  
Co  
ver

quire words and forms of speaking, by which an opinion directly contrary to our faith and opinion is wont to be expressed? Answ. As long as my opinion is not known, if those forms be such, or conceived in such words which admit a true sense, though a false be wont to be expressed by them, I allow them for peace sake. Respon. ad 64. Quest. Page 54.

My Lord of Landaff's Protestation hath set my Pen a running further and faster than I designed; yet I will not give it check, until I have also taken notice of something else, which his Lordship relates in his Book against Mountague, viz. That he told some Divines of the Synod, the cause of all their troubles was, because they had no Bishops amongst them, who by their authority might repress turbulent spirits, that broached novelty, every man having liberty to speak or write what they list. It seems his Lordship was of opinion, that if Holland had but been blessed with Bishops, Arminianism had never come to such an Head in the Low-Countries; and so the Papists tell us, That if we would but submit our selves to the Bishop of Rome, we should then have no differences about the sense of Scripture; yet never any Pope of Rome hath set out any infallible Commentary upon the Bible; nor hath any Episcopal authority in England proved sufficient to root up Arminianism among us. Mr. Mountague when he first sowed the seeds thereof, was of Bishop Carleton's own Diocess, why did he not prevent his innovations taking root? Why could he not keep his own Book against them, from being suppressed? What was the matter that no Convocation ever decided so important a controversy?

I find

I find indeed His Majesty (*Montague* having been much vexed by the Commons) about the year 1626, commanding all the Bishops to come before him, reprehending such as appeared, for not making known to him what was meet to be done about the Five points that made such a noise: but Bishop *Andrews* and Bishop *Land* laying their heads together, thought it was not safe to adventure the determining of those points to a Convocation, till they could get a Convocation more of their own minds; wherefore after all expectations, nothing came forth, but a Proclamation from His Majesty, *Charging his Divines not to vent their heats, by raising any doubts, or publishing and maintaining any new inventions or opinions concerning Religion*: Much like to an Order, the Remonstrants by means of *Barneveldt* procured from the States of *Holland*, on purpose to prevent the calling of a Synod. Of late indeed, I find *Arnold Poelenberg*, in a Preface to the 2d Volume of *Episcopius* his Works, boasting of the great favour that the Remonstrant opinions and Authors, find with our Prelates; and with the leading men in both Universities; but perhaps he *reckons*, as the Proverb is, *without his host*. All experience tells us, that *Episcopacy without the Assistance of the Civil Magistrate, will not put an end to our strifes and contentions; and with the assistance of the Civil Magistrate Presbytery may do it*. But I return to Mr. D. whom I opposed with an Argument drawn from the Synod of *Dort*; I must not forget that he also takes notice of the Synod of *Dort*, and from the civil and respectful language given in it by *Bogerman* to the

the Bishop of Landaff, concludes, That *Holland condemns not our Hierarchy*. And look how many Transmarine Divines he finds dedicating Books to our Bishops or Archbishops, and giving them the titles by which they are commonly called among us; so many good mediums he conceives he hath found to prove that beyond the seas the office of a Bishop or Archbishop is liked and honoured. I only desire him, if he can, to be as good natured to our English-men, and to believe *Thomas Cartwright* was a Convert, because writing to the Archbishop he gives him his Titles; and that Mr. *Prynne* had no design to unbishop *Timothy* and *Titus*, because he dedicates his book to the right reverend Fathers in God, *William of Canterbury*, and *Richard of York*, *Primates of all England*, and *Metropolitans*. And if his heart do not fail him, let him also infer, That *Francis Mason* had no dislike of Popish Hierarchy, because in a Dedicatory to *Henry Bishop of Paris*, he calls him *Amplissimum Præsulem*, and *Antistitem Clarissimum*, and *Virum Reverendissimum*. Dr. *Heylin* was not Master of so much charitable Logick; for speaking (*Hist. of Presf.* p. 282.) of Bishop *Grindals* holding correspondence with *Calvin* and *Beza*, *Zanchy*, *Bullinger*, *Gualter*, and some other of the chief Divines among the *Switzers*, he concludes at length, That they all had their ends upon him, for the advancing of *Presbytery* and *Inconformity* in the Church of England. And really I have observed, that most of the Divines that have by their Letters stroaked our Bishops, have in some places of their Writings given a shrewd knock to the Cause defended by them. Mr. *Dürell*, p. 281. tells us,

That *Danaus* his calling the Archbishop *Reverendissimum in Christo Patrem*, &c. is as much as can be wished to testifie his good liking of the Church of England as it is by Law established: And yet *John Canne* a very troublesome Separatist, makes use of a passage in *Danaus* to justifie his separation from the Church of England. *Mr. Ball* clearly proves that the passage doth not warrant separation; but yet *Danaus* might have written more moderately: for these are his words on 1 Tim. 5. *Ex his omnibus apparet quam nulla sit, vel non legitima eorum verbi Dei ministrorum vel Ecclesia pastorum vocatio, qui solus Regis, vel Regina, vel Patroni vel Episcopi vel Archiepiscopi autoritate diplomate, bullis, jussu & judicio sunt vel eliguntur. Id quod dolendum est, fieri adhuc in iis Ecclesiis, quæ tamen purum Dei verbum habent, & sequuntur, veluti in media Anglia. Nam Anglos homines alioqui sapientissimos, acutissimos, & pietissimos, in istis tamen Papistica Idololatria, & tyrannidis reliquiis agnoscendis, & tollendis, scientes prudentesque cecutire mirum est. Itaque praeclare sentiunt, qui omnem illam chartulariam, & Episcopaticam Curionum & pastorum Ecclesia creandorum rationem, item ex solo Episcopi consensu & diplomate ministrorum verbi cælestis vocationem, approbationem, & inaugurationem damnant, tollendamque ex reformatâ ad Dei verbum Ecclesia censent: quod ordo Dei verbo præscriptus in ordinatione hujusmodi personarum sit prætermisus, ac violatus, sicut perspicue apparet. Denique & senatui Ecclesiastico, & populo Christiano in somne suum atque suffragium misere sit hac ratione, & in hoc genere vocationum Ecclesiasticarum ademptum, & in unum quendam Episcopum magna tyrannide atque;*



atq; abusu translatum. Dominus Deus talibus corruptionibus, quæ adhuc in Ecclesiis ipsius supersunt, & defenduntur, mederi magna sua misericordia dignetur, & velit, quæ tandem certe magnam Ecclesie Dei ruinam secum trahent, & ipsum sacrosanctum verbi Ministerium reddent efficientq. vel mercenarium, vel omnino contemptibile & abjectum. Quod Dominus avertat.

Certainly this is not as much as can be wished to testify *Danaus* his good liking of the Church of England as it is by Law established. *Friderick Spanhem* is another whose complaisant Dedicatory to the great *Usher* seems to Mr. D. a sufficient argument to prove that the Reformed Church of Geneva is no enemy to the Bishops of the Church of England; and yet *Spanhem* in that very third part of his Evangelical Doubts, which he dedicates to the Archbishop, determines it lawful for the innocent person after divorce to marry another wife; quite contrary to Ecclesiastical Laws still unrepealed in the Church of England. Well, that is but a Peccadillo, because many of our own Conformable Divines are of the same mind, and as I suppose, some of our Bishops also. Dr. *Abbot* answering *Bishops* Second part, p. 315. saith, 'That the limitation of divorce which our Saviour giveth, maketh it lawful for the party innocent to marry again, the delinquent being left to the censure of the Church; until satisfaction be given of true repentance for so hainous a sin. The Church of England notwithstanding, for the preventing of some mischiefs that by the wickedness of men do arise by the abuse of the liberty of marriage upon divorce, useth a restraint of that liber-

'ty, that the parties divorced shall put in caution not  
 ' to marry again as long as they both live: As for the  
 Authors of the reformation of our Ecclesiastical laws  
*de Adult. & divorc. c. 6.* they determine plainly, *Cum*  
*alter conjux adulterii damnatus est, alteri licebit inno-*  
*centi novum ad matrimonium (si volet) progredi.* and c. 7.  
*Judex quoties alterum conjugem adulterii condemnat,*  
*alteri sincere persone libertatem denunciare debet ad*  
*novum matrimonium transeundi.* And cap. 19. *Adense*  
*societas & thori solebat in certis criminibus adimi con-*  
*jugibus, salvo tamen inter illos reliquo matrimonii*  
*jure; qua constitutio cum à sacris literis aliena sit,*  
*& maximam perversitatem habeat, & malorum sen-*  
*tinam in matrimonium comportaverit, illud autoritate*  
*nostra totum aboleri placet.* But this, it seems, is not  
 current doctrine now, and so let it pass. The afore-  
 said *Friderick Spanhem* makes Ruling-Elders to be  
 one of those orders of Officers that are designed by  
 Christ for the ruling of his Church, and affirms them  
 to be grounded on Scripture, 1 Cor. 12. 8. 1 Tim.  
 5. 17. So I find him quoted by *Hornbeck* *Instituto*  
*Theol. p. 523, 524.* And it will be difficult for Mr.  
*Durell* to prove that he can approve the divine  
 right of Episcopacy, who makes Lay-Elders (com-  
 monly so called) a divine institution.

Leaving Episcopacy, let us come to Liturgy, that  
 we may see whether Mr. *Durell* be any more hap-  
 py in managing that Controversie. I do easily grant,  
 that he hath by a whole cloud of witnesses proved,

1. That set-forms of prayer are lawful.
2. That most Churches reformed do use set-forms  
 of prayer.
3. That the old English Common prayer-book

was

was not so corrupt, as that a man could not without defiling his conscience, joyn with those who made use of it in the service of God. But all these things had been proved many years before, by an old Non-conformist ( who died about the beginning of the late Wars ) *Mr. John Ball*, both in his tryal of the grounds tending to separation, and in his answer to *Mr. Cann* and others.

If *Mr. Durell* will do any thing to purpose in this Controversie relating to Liturgies, he must prove,

1. That it is lawful for any Church so strictly to tye up her Ministers to a form, as not to allow them to make any use of their own gifts in prayer in publick.

Or else, 2dly, That our Church hath not so tied up her Ministers, but that they may still, any Rubrick or Canon to the contrary notwithstanding, use their own prayer at some times, and upon some occasions in the publick.

If he will endeavour to prove the first, the *Presbyterians* will be concerned to answer him. If the second, there are many of his Conforming brethren will soon be upon his bones; but for ought I see or can find, *Mr. D.* never goes about either to prove the one or the other proposition; and therefore I might be excused if I did wholly dismiss him, and leave him to some of his friends to reconcile him to his own shadow; yet because he swaggers, and accounts that he hath by one thrust left the Assembly of Divines, and the two Houses of Parliament weltring in their blood, I will try *quid tanto dignum feret hic promissor biatu.*

The things laid to the charge of the two Houses, and the Assembly chosen by them, are *manifest untruths, and those uttered in an Ordinance, and in a preface to a Directory for the publick Worship of God throughout the three kingdoms*, vid. p. 3. If any manifest untruths are delivered by them, let them (for me) lye down in their own sorrow and shame, till they have made reparation to the parties injured. But first, we must see whether this heavy charge can be made good against them, else the penance must be laid on him that brought in the charge. The first untruth is, *That the book of Common prayer had proved an offence to the Reformed Churches abroad*. Is this an untruth, and a manifest untruth too? Why, are not the *Walachian Churches in Zealand*, Reformed Churches? and was not the Liturgy used in the Church of *England*, an offence to them? Let Mr. D. read what *Apollonius* in the name of the whole Classis hath written against it, and then tell us his mind; let him also read the several Letters written by *Calvin* and *Beza* touching our Liturgy, and it will be very evident, that some things in our English Liturgy were offensive at *Geneva*; and a man would think something in it was offensive to the Protestant Churches in *France*, or else certainly they would have used their interest with the *French Churches* here in *England* to receive it from Bishop *Laud*, who laboured with all his might for many years to impose it on them, but could not prevail at last. Lastly, for ought I know the *Scottish Churches* may properly enough be called Churches abroad, and Mr. D. will not sure deny but that our Liturgy was offensive to them.

The

The second manifest untruth is, that *the two houses did take away the book of Common-prayer to answer the expectation of other Reformed Churches.* If there were other Reformed Churches besides those, for which the Directory was appointed, that expected the two Houses should take away the Common-prayer-book used in *England*, then was there no manifest untruth in the before-mentioned expression: Let us see whether there were nor. The abolishing of the Common-prayer-book was for the Kingdom of *England*, and Dominion of *Wales*. Can Mr. D. imagine that no other Churches reformed, expected the taking away of the *English* Liturgy? What thinks he of the Reformed Churches of *Scotland*? The Churches of *New England*? those *English* and *Scotish* Churches that were planted up and down the *Low-Countrieys*, and other places of Traffick? Will he nullifie all these Churches? or had they not desires as well as expectations that the Liturgy should be removed? Did he never read with how great regret that Liturgy was obtruded upon those *English* that trafficked in foreign Nations? If he have not, let him vouchsafe to read over the History of Archbishop *Land*, written by Dr. *Heylin*, and then tell us whether he was not too rash to give so many Nobles, Gentlemen, and Divines the lye. If that History bring him under no sense of his temerity, then I entreat him to enquire of the Assembly-men still alive, whether they cannot help him to a sight of the Answers of Foreign Churches, returned to the Latin Letter of the Assembly of Divines; and by most of them he will find, that the designed Reformation was not disgusted by them.

Till he have such an opportunity, it will be wort  
his while to bestow a little time in reading *Apa*  
*lonius* his printed Epistle.

Mr. D. again falls upon the two Houses, p. 14.  
thither I will follow him; where conceiving wrath  
and fiery indignation against an expression in the  
Ordinance of the two Houses, he makes a Manifesto,  
*That there was never, nor is yet any one Reformed*  
*Church, that bath only a Directory, and not a book*  
*of Common-prayer for the publick worship of God.*  
To which Manifesto I say, That the Church of  
*Scotland* had, when the two Houses made that Or-  
dinance, no Book of Common-prayer for the pub-  
lick worship of God, but what was in the nature of  
a Directory; and that the Church of *Scotland* was  
principally in their eye in the management of their  
Reformation; and I also say, that the *Dutch* Li-  
turgy is but in the nature of a Directory, for so I  
understand those words, cap. 11. art. 11. in the  
Harmony of the *Belgick* Synods, *Minister preces*  
*vel distante spiritu, vel certa sibi proposita formula*  
*concipiet.* It may be Mr. D. will put another con-  
struction on them, for he seems to have used other  
Dictionaries than those we have opportunity to  
consult in *England*. In one of the *French* Rubricks  
it is said, that *upon Sundays in the morning the fol-*  
*lowing form is commonly used*; he tells us, p. 17. the  
meaning is, *That that form is to be used always, and*  
*no other.* Could any *Presbyterian* have thought of  
such a meaning? or how can any one of them be  
convinced that *commonly* and *always* are all one?  
why, he may be convinced by constant and uniform  
practice, so he tells us, *ibid.* But I say, constant  
and

and uniform practice will never make *commonly*, to be *always*. I have been a member of the Church of *England* for these Thirty years, and my occasions have called me to be in most Counties of the Nation, and in all these years I never heard any Minister, whether Prelatical or *Presbyterian* read King *James* his Statute against Swearing, and yet the words of the Law are plain. That it shall be read twice every year, were I not a wise man if I should say, the meaning of the Law is, that the Statute shall never be read, as constant and uniform practice doth shew? Thus have I examined what Mr. D. had to say against the Two Houses, and the Assembly, and must now try not the words, but the power of *Ludovicus Capellus* a man of great Learning; but which in his later days especially, he made use of, to the disturbance of the Church: better had it been for the Christian world, that *Sammur* had never had a professor of *Hebrew*, than a Professor that took so much pains to make the *Hebrew* Points, or Vowels, and Accents, a late invention of the *Tiberian Massarites*, long after sundry Translations were extant in the World. All his *Theses* will not do so much good, as his *Arcanum punctuationis revelatum*, and *Critica Sacra* have done hurt. Let us notwithstanding hear what he hath concerning Liturgies, Mr. D. himself being Translator.

‘A Hundred and fourty years ago, when the  
 ‘separation was made from the Church of *Rome*,  
 ‘and that the Christian people, coming out of  
 ‘*Babylon*, did cast off the Popes tyranny, the sa-  
 ‘cred Liturgy was purged of all that Popish su-  
 ‘perstition

'perstition and idolatry, and all such things as  
 'were over-burdenfom, or which did little or no-  
 'thing contribute towards the edification of the  
 'Church; and so were framed and prescribed in  
 'several places, divers set forms of holy Liturgies  
 'by the several Authors of the Reformation that  
 'then was, and those simple and pure in *Germany*,  
 'France, *England*, *Scotland*, the *Netherlands*, &c.  
 'differing as little as possible from the ancient set  
 'forms of the Primitive Church: which set forms  
 'the Reformed have used hitherto with happiness  
 'and profit, each of them in their several Nations  
 'and Districts: Till at last of very late, there did  
 'arise in *England*, a froward, scrupulous and over-  
 'nice (that I say not altogether superstitious)  
 'generation of men, unto whom it hath seemed  
 'good for many Reasons, but those very light,  
 'and almost of no moment at all, not only to  
 'blame, but to cashier, and to abolish wholly the  
 'Liturgy used hitherto in their Church, (together  
 'with the whole Hierarchical Government of their  
 'Bishops) instead of which Liturgy they have  
 'brought in their Directory as they call it.

Mr. D. tells us, pag. 15. That from hence the  
 Reader may observe Five things:

1. *That all reformed Churches have Liturgies;*  
 but I say, That from no words of *Capellus*, any  
 such observation can be collected; if Mr. D.  
 think otherwise, his Logick is his own, let him  
 make use of it.

2. *That the Liturgy of the Church of England is*  
*judged by this great man, not only simple, and pure,*  
*and free from all Popish Superstition and Idolatry;*  
 but



but also from all such things as were over onerous and troubleſom, or which did contribute but little to the edification of the Church. No ſuch obſervation can be made from *Capellus* his words, for he only ſpeaks of the Liturgies that were introduced by the firſt Authors of our Reformation, betwixt which and the preſent Liturgy there may be, for ought Mr. *Capell* ſaith to the Contrary, a vaſt difference: But I believe this great man commended he knew not what, and talked at an high rate of confidence concerning Liturgies of the firſt Reformers which he never ſaw. A Papiſt will not deſire greater advantage againſt the *Præſes* in *Sauvur*, than to have it granted, that in the Liturgies made by the Authors of Reformation in all the places *Capell* mentioneth, nothing was contained onerous, or of little edification. The Divines of King *Henry* the 8th were Authors of a Reformation, their Liturgy had ſomething in it ſuperſtitious, idolatrous, leſs profitable. So had alſo the firſt Liturgy made by our Divines in King *Edwards* time, eſſe we muſt count it profitable to pray for the dead, and to commend our Prayers to be preſented by the holy Angels, &c. And if we ſpeak even of the preſent *Lutherans* Liturgies, every thing that hath little or nothing of profit in it, is not taken away; for what is the profit of *Latin* Cantions? or where is the advantage of Exorcisme? What good is to be got by the Doctrine of Conſubſtantiation? I might urge other queſtions which no friend of *Capellus* would much care for answering.

3. If *Liturgies* ought to recede as little as possible from that of the *Primitive Church*, as he doth intimate, undoubtedly the *Liturgy of the Church of England* is the best, and most perfect of them all as coming nearest unto it. How the Reader should be able to observe this from any words of *Capellus* cannot I divine; it may be Mr. D. heartily thinks that our *Liturgy* cometh nearest to the *Primitive Liturgies*, and so is the most perfect, because *primum in unoquoque genere est mensura reliquorum*: But *Capellus* neither did think so, nor could think so, without egregious contradiction to his own Principle; for he had said just before, That from the beginning the *Formula's* were most brief, and most simple, which without pomp and train, and manifold variety, consisted of a few *Prayers*, and *Lessons* out of the *Psalms* and other *Scripture*: Now certainly if our *Liturgy* be most simple, yet it is not most brief, nor doth it consist of but a few *Prayers*; let Mr. D. read all that by the *Liturgy* is appointed to be read without defalcation, and I will undertake he shall be under no temptation to make his *Sermons* tedious.

4. That of all men who call themselves *Reformed*, the *Presbyterians* are the first that ever left the use of set forms of *Prayers*. *Capellus* useth not the word *Presbyterians*, and if he had used it, it would have been a very blind. Mr. D. seems by *Presbyterians* to mean the major part of those *Divines*, who by vertue of an Ordinance of Parliament did meet to give advice, concerning *Doctrine*, *Discipline*, *Worship*: If *Capellus* say, that these were the first that left off the use of set forms of Prayer,

he

he was much mistaken; set forms of Prayer had been long before laid aside and condemned as unlawful, by such as were as little in love with *Presbytery* as *Hierarchy*; he may know whom I mean, if he will enquire who they were that left old *England*. Dr. *Heylin* hath written the History of *Presbyterians*, under which name, he seems to bring all those Protestants who are not *Lutherans*, nor satisfied with the Reformation of the Church of *England*: This History his Son hath dedicated to the Two Houses of Parliament now sitting. In the 2d Page of that Book it is said, 'The *Zuinglian* Reformation was begun in defacing Images, defacing the established Fasts and appointed Festivals, abolishing set forms of worship, denying the old Catholick Doctrine of a Real Presence, and consequently all external reverence in the participation of the blessed Sacrament; which *Luther* seriously laboured to preserve in the same estate in which he found them at the present. And page 89. speaking of the *Palatine* Churches, he would have us take them for *Antilutherans* in defacing Images, abolishing all distinction of Fasts and Festivals, and utterly denying all set forms of publick Worship. I know a great deal of this is false, maliciously false, as is almost every thing in that Book which relates to the foreign Churches; and therefore I hope the Bishops, or others that have Authority, will either call in the Book, or some other way discover how much they abhor the design of it; in the mean time, here is work for Mr. *Durell's* Pen, if he will not be partial, and respect persons; if he have any zeal left for *Zuing-*  
*lius*,

*lins, Calvin, Beza*, let him wipe off the aspersions of Rebellion, Schism, *Arianism* from their faces, or else let him know, that seeing Dr. *Heylins* Book came out last, his will be thought sufficiently confuted.

5. Mr. D. tells us, we may observe that the many reasons for which the *Presbyterians* have rejected the Book of Common Prayer, are very light, and almost of no moment at all. *Capell* saith not so, but that the Reasons for which it seemed to some scrupulous men, that the Liturgy used by their Church was not only to be disapproved, but also to be plainly abrogated, and wholly to be abolished and obliterated, were light and almost of no moment; so that if any man do only, *improbare*, having no design plainly to abrogate, and wholly to obliterate the Liturgy composed by our first Reformers. he may have Reasons good enough, for ought *Capell* affirms to the contrary.

6. That as for the *Presbyterians* (who are the known Authors of the Directory) they are in *Capell's* judgment a froward, peevish and superstitious generation of men. *Capell* was indeed a man who was free enough in his censures, of any one whether *Presbyterian* or *Episcopal* that stood in his way, not fearing to throw dirt in the face of the great *Hooker* himself, as appears in his Theses about Feasts or Holy-days: But I would fain understand how the *Presbyterians* are the known Authors of the Directory; most of those who were called to give advice about the Directory, were when called to give their advice, Readers of the Liturgy, and had subscribed to the Three Articles in the

36th Canon: When His Majesty was restored few of them were alive, of those few, some at this day are Conformists; let Mr. D. ask them whether they were *Presbyterians* when they consented to the laying aside of the Liturgy? and how they came to widen their Throats so, as to be able to swallow the present Declarations, much bigger than any heretofore enjoyed.

And now I will try whether I can make some truer observations upon *Capellus* his Theses about Liturgies; in doing which I shall follow the edition of *Saumur*, 1651.

1. He saith it is certain that the Apostles and Apostolical men had no prescript form of Liturgy, and that they never did write, and leave or prescribe to their successors any such; for the Apostles needed no such form, nor did those need any whom they made prebends of the Church, and that prescript Liturgies were not necessary, till persecution ceasing, the number of professors much increased, and Piety began to grow cold, and Teachers waxed lazy, so as there could not every where be had Pastors sufficiently learned, and Heresies began to multiply; and that the first prescript forms that were made, were made for the sake of unlearned and simple Pastors, page 706.

2. That Liturgies first began to be made in the more famous Metropolitan and Patriarchal Churches, and that in the Countries called by the name of *Gallia*, there were several Liturgies in almost every several famous Bishoprick, and that every several did contain something proper and singular, and different from the rest, until  
at

\*at last by the tyranny of the Pope, the *Roman*  
 \*Liturgy obtained through all the West. So that  
 it seems, with him, Liturgies are no older than  
 Metropolitan and Patriarchal Churches; how old  
 such Churches were in his judgment, and upon  
 what occasion first erected, is at large declared in  
 his Theses, 337, 338, 339, &c. little as I suppose  
 to the gust of Mr. D.

3. He doth, *Page 707*, plainly mistake the  
 meaning of the *Directory*, and the Composers of  
 it, when he suggests that by it, 'tis left free to  
*Ministers to pray and administer the Sacraments in*  
*what words they please*; for the *Directory* tieth  
 Ministers to a certain form in the administration  
 of Baptism and the Lords-Supper, as also in the  
 solemnization of Marriage. Throughout the  
 whole *Directory* there are, though not Prayers  
 prescribed to be used *totidem verbis*, without any  
 variation, yet such Heads of Prayer, as that he  
 who needs greater help and furniture to enable  
 him for Confession, Petition, Thanksgiving, may  
 well be thought unfit for the Office of a Pastor.  
 And I observe, That the *Directory* orders *Minis-*  
*ters in Prayer before Sermon*, to commend to Gods  
 blessing the Parliament if sitting, and the *Universi-*  
*ties*, and all Schools, and Religious Seminaries of  
 Church and Commonwealth, but in no Liturgy be-  
 sides this last; was there any Prayer for the High  
 Court of Parliament; nor in this last is there any  
 Prayer for the Universities or Schools of Learning;  
 yet in the Constitutions of 1603, In all Colleges  
 and Halls in both Universities, order, form, cere-  
 monies are to be observed, as they are set down,  
 and

and prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, without any omission or alteration. Is not this in effect to tie the Universities never publickly to pray for themselves? If any one should prescribe a Family a form of Prayer, in which was no mention of a Family, it would be thought a strange form.

The said Capell, page 708. tells us, *That sacred Sermons to the people, and exhortations, should be made and composed by the Pastors themselves, and recited to the people either by heart, or out of a Paper, if they can do no other. Postills and Homilies as much as may be are to be driven out of the Church; yet it is better, saith he, that men should hear one reading anothers Sermons, than hear none at all.* In this the Nonconformists throughly agree with him, but some of them will not stick to say, that if some in authority had been as zealous for Sermons as they might have been, we needed not before this time, have wanted for any Cure, a Minister able to make a Sermon of his own: And whereas Capel saith, *That Homilies should not be read, lest they prove, pulvinar ignavia & scordia, & some ignorantia,* they are wont to urge the same Argument against set forms of Prayer; he might have done well to shew that the Reason is not alike forcible in both.

He saith, *ibid.* *Those he had to deal with, deny not but that Lessons, Psalms and Hymns may be read out of a Book to the people, recited and sung; only Hymns and Songs composed by others than men divinely inspired, he saith, they allow not to have any use in the publick Congregation.* Therefore, say I, he did not intend to deal with the Presbyterians,

*terians*, who will never be found any where to have said, that no Hymns may lawfully be sung, but such as are composed by men divinely inspired; I my self have heard some of them sing others, without blame from any of their brethren, nor is there any one tittle in the Directory to the contrary. Let me here enquire whether the *English* Church hath taken any care to have any *Psalms* sung in the Congregation; translation of the *Psalms* into meter we have none generally known, but only that composed by *Hopkins, Sternhold, &c.* 'Tis said that Translation is allowed (allowed, not enjoined) to be used in the Congregation; but Dr. *Heylin* again and again, denieth that ever there was any allowance of it given by any lawful authority; so that the whole service of God with us may be performed, it seems, without any singing at all; for though the *Common Prayer* Book hath sundry parts in it which may be sung, yet it hath nothing that is appointed to be sung, but indifferently, either sung or read. I believe in this we are a singular Church, there being no other that I ever heard, or read of, that hath not enjoined her Congregations to sing some *Psalms*. Mr. *D* certainly can either prove that our Church hath allowed, and enjoined us to sing *Psalms*, or else he can shew us some Reformed Church, that doth not enjoin *Psalmody*. But such is my weakness that I cannot.

6. *Capellus* asketh us, p. 709. *Whether it were not better wisely to prescribe certain forms of Prayer, fit for the publick edification of the Church, than to permit them to the liberty of many Pastors, unlearn-*



ed and unexercised, where others cannot be had? The Presbyterians will answer yes; but they think, in a wealthy Nation, where the King is a Protestant, there is no necessity to take any into the Church for Ministers, if they be unlearned, and unexercised.

7. Page 100. *He asketh whether in all the Prayers that are to be made in the Church, Pastors can perpetually vary them, or express themselves in divers Words and Phrases concerning the same Argument; yea, he asketh what Prophet or Apostle can do this with edification?* Sure he forgets himself; for he before told us, Apostles could and did do it, and I am sure we have had ordinary Pastors here in England that have done it, and we have still hundreds and thousands that can, and would do it; might they be permitted: Nor can I understand how it can be difficult to any one who hath well studied the Scriptures, and observeth the Providences of God, and is affected duly with his own and peoples wants and necessities. I in my Family find it not difficult to vary as I please.

8. Page 710, 711. *He contends that the Creeds are to be recited in a certain form of words; but adds, those whom he dealt with did bewray a manifest hatred against certain forms of Symbols, Confessions and Catechism.* Whence again I infer, that he dealt not with the Directorians; for they liked the use of Confessions and Catechisms in set forms.

9. Page 713. *He thinks the Apotomy and rigor of those men worthily to be condemned, who under pretext of certain and prescribed forms of Liturgy,*

do study to eliminate out of the Church all use of Prayers conceived by Ministers themselves. This will touch Mr. D's Copyhold, unless he can prove against Dr. Heylin and others, that some Prayers, besides those prescribed in the Liturgy, are allowed to Ministers in publick ministration.

10. Page 716. He determines, that it is better by much, and more convenient and safe, that those writings only should be publicly read which are truly Canonical, and divinely inspired. What will the peremptory enjoyners of the Apocryphal Chapters say to this?

11. Page 719. Drawing up the sum of all his conceptions, he saith, 1. That forms are not simply and absolutely necessary. 2. That they are not commonly necessary, but only for order and decorum sake. 3. That they are plainly necessary, where we cannot have learned Ministers. 4. Where there are learned and skilful Pastors, a publick form of Liturgie is very useful and necessary to the common edification of the Church, in the same communion of Divine worship. 5. The use of Liturgies cannot of right be condemned or disallowed. To all these Propositions there are Hundreds of Non-conformists can subscribe, and are ready to subscribe, the two last only being qualified with such distinctions, as I believe, were not either against, or besides the mind of this Professor. The Arguments of the Brownists and others which he scattereth up and down, were fully propounded, and clearly answered by Mr. John Ball, before his Theses saw the light. Let Mr. Baxters propositions concerning Liturgies be read and weighed, and

it

it will be found, that they come very near, to these of *Capellus*.

I must now come to Ceremonies: The first I mention, is the use of a *Surplice*; concerning which, the Nonconformists say, That if they receive it, they must receive it not only as *-serving to a decent order and godly discipline*; but as apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification, whereby he might be edified; but they have never found any such aptness in it to stir up their dull minds to the remembrance of their duty, and that they dare not pretend to use a thing in order to such an end, as they never expect to attain by it. I my self have talked with some conformable Ministers, and asked them, whether they ever found their dull minds stirred up by the use of it? they have been loth to give me any answer, but what moved on the *Latitudinarian* hinge: One indeed told me, he did verily believe there was a wonderful vertue in it to excite his dull mind; but asking him further, whether it was apt to excite him as a man, or as an English man, or as a Minister? He gave me a reply, which for Friendship sake, I will not here insert; but such it was, that I easily saw the *Surplice* had not cured him of all his dulness. Nor can I chuse but wonder why they who pretend to be stirred up to a remembrance of their duty by a *Surplice*, do use it so seldom: there are but few that use it constantly, some use it not above once a quarter, few use it in the Pulpit, yet I suppose their minds are apt

to be as dull in the Pulpit as in the Desk; and the Church as much requires them to use the Surplice at all times of their Ministration, as at any time. Perhaps we must say of Surplices, as of pleasure, *commendat rarior usus.*

Well, but how doth Mr. D. discourse of Surplices? Truly very innocently: He tells us, Page 23, 24. That in *Aquitain when a Minister is buried, the neighbour Ministers that be present must all have their Gowns, if Gowns can conveniently be had* (that was wisely put in). *Now this changing of apparel for divine service* ( it seems burying of a Minister in France is Divine Service ) *is the very same thing for which the Church of England is by some men reputed Popish and superstitious, when she will have her Ministers to wear Surplices on the same occasion.* It should seem with him the Surplice is no Symbolical Vestment, and that he reckons all those who put on their solemn apparel and best Clothes do the same thing that he doth, when he puts on significant Garments: But he is so kind, that lest this should not satisfy, he will find out some of the best Reformed Churches, that count it no superstition for their Ministers to wear a Surplice, and he instanceth in the Bohemians, Polonians, Lithuanians, who did put on the surplice as oft as they preached in the Churches of the Augustan confession: But it seems they lost nothing by this condescension, for the Lutherans officiated in their Churches without a Surplice. To requite him for this discovery, I will tell him of some Lutheran Ministers ( viz. the Lutherans in Holland ) that do not use a Surplice, no not in their own Churches;

Churches; so little do they find it to contribute to edification, that they forbear it, where they would not be blamed if they should use it: So the *Presbyterians* are out of his debt.

A second Ceremony controverted is kneeling at the Sacrament; about which, I may say, [*Iliacos extra muros peccatur & intra*] I cannot by all that I have read, see any unlawfulness in it, and I hope the *Presbyterians*, if they should be asked by any, whether they had better forbear the Sacrament than receive it kneeling, wou'd well be-think themselves what answer to give. I find not that ever any of our authorized Liturgies did allow any other gesture; yet I have read in a Book, called *Treasure out of rubbish*, "That some Commissioners of *Q. Elizabeth* did about the "beginning of Her Reign, at *Coventry*, and other "places appoint, not kneeling, but standing to be "used at the Lords Table: The Book was Printed by the Reverend Mr. *Simeon Ash* since His Majesties return to his Throne; and I hear that many conforming Ministers are so compassionate, as to deliver the consecrated Elements to those who do not kneel; how they can so do, *non violata fide quam dederunt ecclesia*, I understand not, they themselves I hope have satisfied their own Consciences, and can give a reason of their practice to their Governors though I cannot. The Church in the 2d Book of King *Edward* inserted a *Rubrick* against Transubstantiation, unhappily left out in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, King *James*, King *Charles* the 1st, but through the goodness of our present Sovereign, now again put into the last

Edition of our Liturgy ; may it never more be left out, but continue to the shame of those who feared not to say, we left it out, because it seemed too much to favour the Sacramentarians. The Church also appoints the Minister to use a kind of a Prayer, in delivering the Eucharist, whilst he useth that Prayer, the Communicant is to kneel meekly ; but when he hath taken the Bread into his own hands, he may then sit and eat it, or stand and eat it ; I wish this could satisfie private Christians, but there are Hundreds that cannot so quiet their own minds ; and yet if you discourse with them, they can make Syllogisms, and they live peaceable and godly lives : Now here the Shoe pincheth the Non-conformist Minister, whether he can promise never to give the Sacrament to any one who scruplenth kneeling ?

Had Mr. D. clearly and solidly determined this question, or had he strongly proved that the Church could not without dishonour allow more than one gesture in receiving the Sacrament, I could easily have forgiven him all the raillery of his book ; but he thought he could get preferment at an easier rate, & therefore contents himself, in a few lines (p. 46, 47.) to instance in a very few Reformed Churches that receive the Sacrament kneeling : First, he instanceth in the Reformed Churches of *Bohemia, Reformed above two hundred years ago ; the remnant of it now left*, saith he, *receive it kneeling*. This instance little availeth our Church, because *from the beginning it was not so ; the Ancestors of the Bohemians did at first, viz. 1494, use standing ; but being persecuted on that account, were compelled to leave it off*, as Comenius

menius tells us ; so that Mr. D. by this only proves the conformity of our Church with the Popish Church, in persecuting those who will not kneel at the Sacrament. Nor is he more lucky in his other instances of *Polonia major*, and *Lithuania*, for which he refers us to the *Consensus Polonicæ*. What a Character Dr. Heylin gives of the Reformation of Poland, let him that loveth railing see, *Hist. of Presb.* 31, 32, 33. Indeed the Consent of Poland doth not much hit our humour here in England; for in the *Cracovian Synod*, 1573, all Chorea are condemned as dishonest. A question being moved, Whether the rites in the use of the Lords Supper ought to be uniform? It was concluded, That according to the custom of the Primitive Church, men should be left to their Christian liberty, yet with admonition to the brethren, that if any used sitting, they should leave that proper to the Arrian Anabaptists. In the *Petrovian Synod*, Anno 1578, it is determined, That uniformity in the rite of receiving the Lords Supper, should not be pressed, lest it should happen that there might be occasion to exercise Ecclesiastical Discipline upon any of the common people, who are not easily brought to unusual ceremonies; whereas the Synod judged it neither agreeable to the will of the Lord, nor the custom of the Christian Church more pure, to strike Christian men with the rod of Discipline for external rites, yet so as the gesture of sitting at the Lords Table is rejected for a reason I shall more speak of by and by. 'Tis the *Synodus Wlodsлавien-sis* congregated 1583, that Mr. D. pitcheth upon, in which Synod the matter of sitting at the Lords Table is again debated; and there it is determined,

tha

that sitting is as free as any other gesture ; which being brought in by way of *Parentesis*, Mr. D. never Englisheth or taketh notice of ; for he had called it an *unmannerly* and *irreverent* gesture ; and it was no wisdom to touch a knife that would be sure to cut his fingers ; but there also it was determined, That sitting should not be used at the Lords table in any of the Churches of Poland or Lithuania, for this ceremony is not used in Christian Churches, and Evangelical Assemblies, and is only proper to the unbelieving *Arrians* placing themselves in a seat or throne equal to Christ. Seeing therefore sitting crept into some of their Churches, especially by occasion of those who denied the Lord that redeemed us ; they desire and exhort all their assemblies and brethren in the Lord, that they would change sitting into standing or kneeling. Mr. D. translates *potissimum* first ; and I believe he was the first that so translated that word. Not content to make so bold with *Priscian*, he riseth to greater impudence, saying that what they observed about the first bringers in of sitting into Poland, may be our observation also, if what Dr. Owen have said be true, as it is very likely, That there is not a city, a town, scarce a village in England, but had some of the *Miscreant* Socinians. Whether Dr. Owen hath any words of this import, I know not ; if he have, 'tis like he referred them to the time in which he did make his book, which was many years after that sitting was brought into the English Churches by the two Houses. Too many there were in the two Houses, no doubt, that sought their own things more than the Nations peace ; but they never had among them any *Socinian* that ever

I did



I did hear of, but only one *Fry*, who was also expelled when he discovered his blasphemies : Nor do I find that these Hereticks do abound in those places of the Kingdom where I have been, but Papists abound extremely ; so as the same thing that moved the *Polonians* to forbid sitting, may move us to forbid kneeling, and leave it proper to the wretched Papists, who worship a piece of bread instead of their Saviour.

But this gesture of kneeling would be a little better considered : The Fathers of the before mentioned Synods seem to say ( not indeed in that Meeting which Mr. D. quotes, but in the Meeting of 1578. ) *That those who fell off to Arrianism, were the first that were authors of sitting in their Churches.* If I mistake their meaning, *detur venia* ; but if I do not, I humbly conceive they were themselves mistaken. *John Alasco*, a Noble-man of *Poland*, was upon *Cranmer's* persuation sent for into our *England* by King *Edward* the sixth, about the year 1549. and permitted to have a Church of strangers, especially of *Dutch*, whom he brought up to receive the Sacrament sitting ; and also during his abode here, put forth a book to prove the lawfulness of that gesture : After many troublesome wandrings from place to place, at last being invited by at least forty Letters, he returned to his own Countrey, and no question administred the Sacrament to his flock sitting, and taught others on whom he had influence so to do : Now this *Alasco* never fell off to *Arrianism* ; perhaps this was the reason why in the Meeting 1583. it is not said, *that the Arrians first brought in sitting, but that it was chiefly brought*

brought in by them. The aforeſaid Fathers ſeem alſo to affirm, that ſitting had not been uſed by any Evangelical Churches in Europe, at the time of their meeting; but if they ſo meant, they were greatly miſtaken; for ſitting was brought into the Church of Scotland by authority, as the moſt proper and convenient geſture, 1560. and our Confefſor Mr. *Thomas Becon*, in an authorized Catechiſm 1563. ſpeaks of ſitting as a geſture uſed in certain Reformed Churches, and which he himſelf could beſt allow, if it were received by publick authority and common conſent. Who the *Abrian-Anabaptiſts* were, that had cauſed ſuch a deteſtation of themſelves among the *Polonians*, I cannot certainly know; but by ſuch ſtories as have come to my hands, I gueſs they were *Georgius Blandrata*, and *Franciſcus Davidis* and their Spawn, who both denied the Divinity of *Jeſus*, and alſo his adorability. *Socinus* and his followers held the Principle, That *Jeſus* is not God, and yet denied the concluſion that naturally and lineally deſcended from it, That *Jeſus* is not to be worſhipped; for they had ſound out a diſtinction of *Deus natus & factus*. The former would not ſtick to ſay. That *Jeſus* was one of their brethren and fellow ſervants; ſo would the latter: for they aſcribed unto Chriſt a dignity and excellency nearly approaching unto the dignity and excellency of the Creator, but conferred on him by the ſingular bounty and good will of him who created him. Wherefore the *Socinians* properly ſo called, could not uſe ſitting at the Lords Table as a token of their equality with Chriſt, nor indeed do they much concern themſelves what geſture is uſed

used in Sacramental Communion. *Volkelius* saith, *They use sitting ; but yet so, that they damn not those who had rather use standing, so as there be no appearance of idolatry.* They would have us believe they hate the very appearance of Idolatry, and yet they commit Idolatry : for what greater Idolatry, than to worship him that by nature is not God, as they blasphemously say *Iesus is not, & ta'ta min si ta'ta.*

The last Ceremony, but about which there is the greatest Controversie, is the sign of the Cross. Nonconformists say this sign is made a Sacramental sign, because it is *used as a token that the child shall not be ashamed to profess Christ crucified, &c.* and also as a ceremony by which it is dedicated unto God. In clearing this ceremony therefore, Mr. D. should have taken most pains ; but in this he is slightest of all. He gives us not an instance of any one Reformed Church that hath appointed the sign of the Cross to be used either in Baptism or in any other Ordinance ; only he tells us of Bibles printed at *Geneva* for the use of the Church, and that before them, Christian Religion is represented in an Emblem as leaning upon a Cross, and that some Reformed have Crosses upon their Churches, and that some Ministers in *Prussia*, to humor the *Lutherans*, will make a Cross in the Alt with their hand when they say, *The Lord be with you.* All this is to as much purpose, as if he had told us, that the Rumpers did use the sign of the Cross in the Flags of their Ships, and put it on the money which they coined, or that some Nonconformists have it in their Coat of Arms, as I am sure they have.

I be-

I believe there is not a Nonconformist in *England*, that questioneth the lawfulness of making the sign of a Cross upon any thing he useth: And if the sign of the Cross were made so, as that it remained, and were visible after it were made, then perhaps it might have an aptitude to occasion a good thought concerning a crucified Saviour; but what can be the benefit of a Cross that leaves no impression on the forehead? I know the Baptismal water being applied to an infant, leaveth no such mark on the flesh as it can take notice of at years of discretion; but the Spirit, if he be not grieved, will bring our Baptism to our remembrance, and he hath so done to many in the hour of temptation; but how shall a man be secured, that the blessed Spirit will engage himself to bring our being crossed to our remembrance? I have made observation, and could never find any difference betwixt us that were crossed, and those who were not crossed; Do we confess the Faith of a crucified Saviour? so do they; do we fight under his Banner? so do they; do we joyn our selves to Christs flock? so do they; the things that we know, they know also; so that they are under a temptation to think that the Cross is an useles sign:

I must not dissemble that Mr. D. takes on him in his Sermon, page 29. to explicate and shew the usefulness of this sign. *As when the King having created those noble Knights of his Order bestows on them the Garter and the Blew Riband, as Badges to be known by of others, and to put them in mind of the great honour done unto them: In like manner, when an infant hath by Baptism been enrolled in the*

*Militia*

Militia of the King of Glory, Jesus Christ our Lord ; this sign of the Cross is made upon his forehead, to declare unto all such as are present, and as many as shall thereafter know it, that he hath received it, and to himself when he comes to years of understanding, that he was consecrated to Christ crucified, that he hath put on his Livery, and wears his Badge, that he is bound to crucifie the old man, and to bear the Cross, that to this he is called by our Saviour ; that he ought in all places, and in the most dangerous occurrences, boldly and openly to own the name of his Redeemer ; without ever being ashamed with bearing his reproach. As the Barrels go rumbling up and down the Streets, so my Lord Mayor owes me a Groat. The King, the founder of this noble Order, gives the Knights created by him a Garter and a Blew Riband, as Badges to be known by others, but would not be pleased if they should among themselves invent other badges and cognizances of their Order. Christ also hath instituted Baptism to distinguish Christians from those who are no Christians ; How do we know whether it will like him, that we should appoint a Cross to distinguish us more, especially seeing thereby we shall be distinguished from a great number of our fellow Christians. Again, the Garter and Blew Riband are things to be worn, and that may be seen, and occasion spectators to enquire what they mean, but so is not the Cross that was made on our foreheads after Baptism ; the Pagans that any of us have been among, could take no notice of it ; and if our Parents did at any time admonish us of our engagement to crucifie the old man, they  
put

put us in mind, not of being crossed, but of being baptized with Water, to signify the not only death, but burial of the old man ; nor have our Kings of *England* been so fond of all the Rites and Ceremonies used at making of Knights of the Garter, but that they have allowed some of them to be omitted, where they have conceived they might be less acceptable. King *James* being much pleased with the valour and piety of *Maurice* Prince of *Orange*, sent him a Garter, appointing his Ambassador *Sir Ralph Winwood* to confer the honour on him freely, and without any Rites or Laws, but what the Prince himself would spontaneously undergo. And the Ambassador in a *French* Speech declared, that the Rites wonted to be used in creating Knights of the Garter, did seem somewhat abhorrent from the Discipline of the Reformed Churches in *Holland*, and not altogether congruous to the polity of the Republick ; and that therefore the King to avoid offence had appointed it to be conferred without pomp and external magnificence. I suppose Mr. *D.* thinks there is no Rite used in the creation of the Knights of *St. George*, that is contrary to the Discipline of the *Dutch* Churches ; but the King was of another mind, and chose rather to confer the highest honour without the wonted Ceremonies, than not to confer it upon one who was like not to disgrace it. And shall Ministers of the Gospel so stiffly stand upon Ceremonies, as rather not to administer baptism, than to administer it without the sign of the Cross ?

I must follow Mr. *D.* who tells us, *That several*

ral reformed Churches have a Ceremony, of which, Presbyterians ought to have as bad an opinion, as of the Cross in Baptism: The Ceremony be meaneth is Trine aspersion, page 42. Why ought they to have as bad an opinion of Trine Aspersion, as of the Cross in Baptism? is there any Law either of God or man, that tieth them to have as bad an opinion of the Trine Aspersion as of the Cross? or do their Principles lead them to have as bad an opinion of one Ceremony as of the other? I verily believe they do not; for they say, that Christ hath commanded Baptism, and hath not strictly determined whether it shall be administred by Aspersion or Immersion, nor whether by *trine* or *une* aspersion or immersion; therefore the Church hath power to chuse the Rite, that to her, having consulted the general rules of Scripture, and practice of the Primitive Churches, shall seem best. But they also say, that God hath no where commanded that a Child shall be crossed, or any where appointed his Church to institute any symbolical, teaching signs at all; if Mr. D. can shew them any command that a Child should be crossed, they will not stick to grant, that it is in the Churches power to order, where the Child shall be crossed, and how often, and what kind of cross it shall be: But it is to be feared he can shew no such command, at least none such is shewed by him; and yet he saith, *he is confident that if the trine aspersion were used, or if we had retained the trine immersion, as at the beginning of King Edward the sixths reign, it would be accounted a gross superstition.* How may a man do to free him from

this uncharitable confidence so contrary to Christianity? I dare undertake to give it him under the hand and seal of as many as I am acquainted with, that if the Church shall think meet to use *trine* aspersion, or *trine* immersion, she shall not be accounted either grossly, or at all superstitious, provided she declare that she doth not use either rite as necessary. If by *trine* either aspersion or immersion she should prejudice the Babes in their health, that would be a sin, but not the sin of superstition. But how doth Mr. D. prove, that the Church hath not retained *trine* immersion? Immersion it is plain she hath enjoyned, unless the Sureties certifie that the Child be weak (yet never any Minister of the Church, in my hearing, demanded such Certificate; never did any Parents bring their Child in a dress fit for dipping, that ever I could observe, and yet I believe that I have seen as strong Children Baptized as are in most places of *England*) and she no where saith it shall be dipped but once, as neither doth she say, that it shall be sprinkled but once; so that Bishop *Mountague* in his Visitation Articles positively asserts, That the Child is to be thrice aspersed with water on the face; it may be some other Prelate of that age did as positively assert that the Child was to be sprinkled but once; for those who have been most zealous to press Conformity, have been at Daggers drawing about the meaning of some passages in that Liturgy, to which they required subscription. In the *Hampton Court* Conference, the Metropolitan told the King, That the administration of Baptism by women and lay persons

was  
enq  
sure  
any  
plic  
of C  
to d  
vate  
with  
prae  
in th  
St.  
man  
know  
King  
a c  
mini  
wore  
tism  
rish,  
that  
Lay  
Heyli  
bisho  
was g  
on of  
necess  
the w  
motion  
tion!  
of Ba  
did e  
thorit



was not allowed in the practice of the Church, but enquired of by Bishops in their visitations and censured; neither do the words in the Liturgy infer any such meaning: But the Bishop of London replied, That those learned men who framed the Book of Common-Prayer, intended not by ambiguous terms to deceive any, but did intend a permission of private persons to baptize in case of necessity, and withal declared that the same was agreeable to the practice of the ancient Church, urging both a place in the Acts; and the authority of Tertullian and St. Ambrose plain in that point: (What could a man have done that had lived in those days to know the meaning of the Church?) But however King James being clear in his own judgment, that a Minister is of the essence of the right and lawful ministry of the Sacrament, carried it, so as the words thereafter did run thus, That private Baptism should be performed by the Minister of the Parish, or in his absence by any other lawful Minister that can be procured: Now any man would think Lay persons are not allowed to Baptize; but Dr. Heylin in his introduction to the life of Archbishop Laud, page 27. saith, That the alteration was greater in sound than sense, it being the opinion of many great Clerks, That any man in cases of necessity (that is extream) who can but pronounce the words of Baptism, may pass in the account and notion of a lawful Minister. A prodigious assertion! for a Turk or Jew may pronounce the words of Baptism, Is he a lawful Minister of Baptism? did ever any that pretended to reverence the authority of the Church thus wrest her words?

But to return to the rite of Baptism; we have got a trick to sprinkle, or to let water fall by drops, but the Church allows no such rite, but most expressly requires pouring, even when the Child is at the weakest; and seeing in the Baptism of Infants the Administrator is required to dip them if they may well endure it, how comes it to pass that in the Baptism of Adult persons who are appointed by fasting and prayers to prepare themselves for the receiving of the Sacrament, it is left indifferent to the Ministers either to dip them in the Font, or pour water on them, though there be a moral certainty, that they may endure dipping well enough? And what Prayers must these adult persons use to prepare themselves for Baptism, must they make them themselves, or must they be made by the Bishop or Priest? or are there any preparatory Prayers to that purpose made already? I wish Mr. D. would answer me these questions.

Object. Well, but what say you in the excuse of the Presbyterians, who as Dr. Heylin tells us, page 293. would not have their Children Baptized by the names of their Ancestors, Richard, Robert, &c. but by some name occurring in the Holy Scriptures, especially in the Old Testament, because meerly Hebrew, and not prophaned with any mixture of the Greek or Roman. Did not Snape and Cartwright in the Book of Discipline agree that the Minister in Baptizing Children, should not admit of any such names as had been used in the time of Paganism, the names of Idols and the like? Did they not also

take

take an humor of giving such names unto their Children, as many of them when they came to age were ashamed of, Accepted, Deliverance, Discipline, Praise God, Reformation, Tribunal, Thankful.

*Ans.* As for the Discipline of Jersey and Guernsey, made by Mr. Cartwright and Snape, I never saw it but once, when I minded not what was in it; now I know not where to get it, and therefore leave it to Mr. D. to answer for his forefathers and neighbors. The Presbyterians have not hired me to be their Advocate, I am only for peace, and would not have men made worse than they be: 'Tis doubtless an unjust scrupulosity for any man to question the lawfulness of calling his Child either Robert, or Richard, or Arthur, or William; but if the Question be not what is lawful, but what is expedient, I say, *ceteris paribus*, it is more expedient that Children be named by the names of such persons as were famous in their generations for piety and learning.

Dr. Rivet tells Baily, *Traictat* 3. page 33. Quest. 8. That they used diligence to bring Parents to give to their Children names borrowed from them whose life was laudable in the Church, that they may be stirred up to the imitation of those whose name they bear, for such better agree to Christians, than either the ambitious or superstitious names of Heathens. He also tells us, that in his remembrance a vain-glorious fellow whose name was *Le Grand*, would needs name his Child *Alexander*, but the Ministers refused to gratifie his ambition, they would not have a mean fellows Child called

*Alexander the Great*; but that ever any *Presbyterian* refused to Baptize a Child because it was to be called *Richard*, may well pass for a Story of *Dr. Heylin's* ( which many times are none of the truest ) As for the reason he gives out of his own head, of the *Presbyterians* chusing *Old Testament* names, because the *Old Testament* is meerly *Hebrew*; it argueth his great ignorance, some of the *Presbyterians* Children, before they come from School, know that the *Old Testament* is not meerly *Hebrew*. Where our English Tongue can afford happy compositions, I should think such a composition in a Childs name would not make Baptism contemptible, nor the Imposer ridiculous; yet I confess I should never advise any man to name his Child *Praise God*, nor, *The Lord is near*, for though he may excuse himself, by the names of *Quod vult Deus*, *A deo-datus*, usual in *St. Austin's* time, yet it favors of affectation to give such names, and it may occasion the taking of the Lords name in vain, nor do I find that *Presbyterians* have delighted themselves in such names. Accepted was the name of *Dr. Fremen* late Archbishop of York, was he ever ashamed of it? or had he any reason to be ashamed of it? or was his Father a *Presbyterian*? Let the Church Books from 1582 be searched, and it will be found to the shame of this Historian, that *Presbyterians* have given such names to their Children as other people did, and that none of their Children are called by such uncouth names as are mentioned in the Objection.

My next task is to give in a Catalogue of Mr. D's impertinencies, which are indeed many, and too many to be insisted on particularly.

Page 51. *He gives us some sayings of some Churches against Sacriledg*: A thing that hath been done more copiously by Dr. *John Hoornbeck* in his examination of the Popes Bull, sent forth to nullifie the peace of *Germany*; and if Mr. D. please, he may read a very smart Discourse against the sin of Sacriledg in Mr. *Baxters* defence of the *Worcestershire* Petition. If Ancestors through mistake have given maintenance to Idolatrous uses, Magistrates may convert that maintenance to uses truly pious. If there be a true superfluity of Church revenues for some one good use, Magistrates may out of that superfluity provide for some other good use. If the Sovereign power please in cases of true necessity, to make use of Church-mens Lands, as well as others, to maintain the Nation against foreign Invasions, &c. what is there in such an action blame-worthy? These and such like cases excepted, I profess I know not the *Presbyterian* alive or dead, that was not against the alienation of Church-Lands. Mr. D. tells us, *he saw some Presbyterian Ministers made nothing of purchasing and detaining Church-Lands*, and in his Margin nameth Dr. *Burges*; so that it seemeth, Dr. *Burges* is *some Presbyterian Minister*: But he ought before he so called him, to prove that he was so much as *one Presbyterian Minister*; he was not that Dr. *Burges*, of whom we heard before, that made the Book against Dr. *Ames* his reply to Dr. *Morton*,

but he was the Dr. *Burges* that oversaw that Book in the Press, and adorned its Margin to make the reading more pleasant and delightful ; and he was that Dr. *Burges* who did write for Baptifmal Regeneration ( a Doctrine distastful to the *Presbyterians* ). He took the Covenant indeed, but not ( as I have heard ) till he was like to be turned out of the Assembly for not taking it. It is true, that once he made a Speech against the continuance of *Deans* and *Chapters*, but in that Speech he declared the utter unlawfulness of converting their Lands to any private mans use ; it seems that he himself afterwards purchased something belonging to the Dean of *Wells*, intending to settle it on his Children ; how he could satisfie his Conscience so to do I know not ; perhaps when he saw that that part of the House of Commons which favoured *Presbytery* was secluded, and that *Deans* and *Chapters* Lands designed to mend poor Livings, must be sold for other ules, he resolved to do as *Luther* saith a Dog which he knew at *Erford* did, when he could defend his Masters dish of meat from other Dogs no longer, viz. got as good a share of the prey as he could. He hath given his accounts to his Master, I am not to judge anothers Servant, and therefore I should tremble to write that which Mr. D. hath written, viz. That a loathsome sore which brought him to his Grave, was sent to punish him for his Sacriledg ; neither dare I say, for all the world, that the Disease that befell *Bishop Gauden* ( and of which he died ) beset him for his fierceness against the *Presbyterians* ; and yet, it was the very disease unto which he had compared the *Presbyterians* Sermons, and it befell him

him not long after he had made that odious comparison.

England hath suffered much by mens undertaking to fetch their Divinity out of the Providences of God, which are always righteous, but sometimes hidden.

A greater noise is made in some Books, on the account of the Assemblies Annotations; in the which, or in the first Edition of which, it is said, *Nothing is to be found against Sacriledg*; and it is easily acknowledged, that in the Assemblies Annotations nothing is to be found against Sacriledg, for the Assemblies Annotations are not to be found: But as for the *English Notes* made by sundry Divines, who were all of them before the Wars, Conformists, and commonly miscalled the *Assemblies Annotations*; and for the Assembly it self, hear an ingenuous, but cordial and through-paced Son of the Church, in a Discourse entituled, *Church-Lands not to be sold*, printed Anno 1648. he quotes with approbation the Note on *Rom. 2.22.* p. 14. having spoken p. 27. of honest Mr. Geree, who avers, *That to abolish Prelacy, and to seize the Lands of the Prelates to any private or civil interest, undoubtedly could not want stain nor guilt*: he adds, *I am confident, by the discourse I have had with the most able of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, that at the least three parts, if not all of them, are of the same judgment; and that they would openly profess as much, if they were put to answer the question.* The same Author quotes with approbation the Note on *Gen. 47.* and on *Mal. 3.8,9.* I will not go off from this subject of Sacriledg, till  
I have

I have also observed, That some, considerable for Learning, and of no small authority, have not feared to say, That *Impropriations are sacrilegious*. I have not much studied the point, and therefore interpose not my own judgment; but *it looks very ugly to take away so much of the tythes and profits of any parish, as not to leave a competence for him who hath the cure of souls in that parish*: yet it hath been observed, that no Parishes have so sorry and pitiful an allowance for the Preaching-minister, as those of which Clergy-men are the Impropriators; if the Kings Letter since his return hath so kindly operated upon our Cathedralists, as to make them more bountiful to the Incumbents, it is well; but if it have not, Mr. D. may do well to consider whether he and his brethren be without fault, before he throw stones at the head of others, else he may chance to have such an answer as the Bishop of Scotland, who having objected Sacriledg to the Presbytery of that Nation, is told by Mr. Baily in his *Historical Vindication*, p. 26, 27. "That the  
 "Bishops when they professed their greatest zeal  
 "to recover all the Church out of the hand of the  
 "Laity, were found to be but too ready to dila-  
 "pidate unto Noblemen, and others too much of  
 "the Churches Patrimony: you your self may  
 "remember what bargain you made, as I think with  
 "the Earl of *Seaforth*, which you know was the  
 "first occasion of diminishing your reputation  
 "with your great Patron *Land of Canterbury*, I  
 "am sure your Colleague *Spotswood* did sell the  
 "whole Abbacy of *Kilwinning* to the Noblemen  
 "and Gentlemen of *Cunningham*, to the great pre-  
 "judice



“judice and grief of the Univerſity of *Glaſgow*,  
 “and the Miniſters of the bounds, who had great  
 “interſt therein. At the Parliament of *Lithgow*,  
 “1606, our good Biſhops for their own baſe ends  
 “did conſent in the name of the Church (though  
 “they never conſulted her in that buſineſs) to the  
 “greateſt dilapidation that ever was heard of in  
 “*Scotland*, the Impropriation to Noblemen and  
 “Gentlemen of no fewer than ſixteen Abbacies,  
 “every one whereof had incorporate the Rents  
 “of a number of Pariſh-Churches.

A ſecond impertinence relates to *Confirmation*,  
 which Mr. *D.* p. 43. ſaith, *he finds uſed in almoſt*  
*all Reformed Churches, in ſome with greater, in ſome*  
*with leſſer ſolemnity.* To what purpoſe doth he tell  
 us this? Would he have the world believe, that  
 the *Presbyterians* are againſt Confirmation? or  
 that they do not earneſtly deſire it? Have not Mr.  
*Hanmer* and Mr. *Baxter* written books to ſhew  
 the uſefulneſs and neceſſity of it? Do not ſome of  
 them ground it on *Heb.* 6. 2. and draw thence an  
 argument for Infant-baptiſm? Mr. *Tombs* knows  
 they do, and ſo do many others of the *Antipedo-*  
*baptiſts.* For my part I bleſs God that hath put it  
 into the hearts of the Convocation, to inſert into  
 this laſt Edition of the Liturgy, a queſtion to be  
 propounded to thoſe who are confirmed: let con-  
 ſcience be made never to confirm any but thoſe who  
 are well inſtructed in the Church Catechiſm, and  
 are well reported of for their converſation, and I  
 ſhall think then that nothing is to be blamed in our  
 order for admiſſion to the Sacrament of the Lords  
 Supper. But if men will pretend a great reve-  
 rence

rence to Confirmation, and yet suffer the far greatest part of the Nation to communicate unconfirmed; and if Bishops will confirm persons grossly ignorant and scandalous in the highest degree, and never require Certificates from the Ministers of those Parishes to which they belong, God forbid that I should justify them.

The only question considerable about Confirmation, betwixt those called *Presbyterians*, and their adversaries, is concerning the Minister thereof: *Presbyterians* say, *That no Law of God hath appropriated it to a Bishop strictly so called.* If Mr. D. can shew us any such Law, or if he can prove that in all or in any Reformed Church, a meer *Presbyter* is not accounted to have power to confirm, as well as to baptize, he shall do something; let him therefore shew himself a man, and undertake this work, and when he hath his hand in, let him also wipe off a blot thrown upon the Church of *England* and *Geneva* by Dr. *Heylin*, with the Pen of a virulent Papist, *William Reynolds*, *History of Presby.* pag. 283. viz. That, 1576, the *Common-prayer-Book* was Printed by Richard Jugg the *Queens Printer*, the whole order of private Baptism, and confirmation of Children being omitted, which omission was designed to bring the Church of *England* into some Conformity to the desired Orders of *Geneva*.

Pag. 47. he is so prodigal of his Ink and Paper, as to tell us, *That in all reformed Churches Matrimony is celebrated in the publick Congregation, and by the Minister.* This may be true of all reformed Churches in reference to their own Members, at least I hope it is; but if he should intend to assert,  
That

That Reformed Churches allow not that any who are constant livers in the same Cities with them, shall be married otherwise than by the Ministers, and in the Church, he is mistaken. Yet let it be supposed, that Papists, dwelling with Protestants, are forced to marry in the Church, and to make use of a Minister; what is this to the Presbyterians? The composers of the Directory say, *We judge it expedient that Marriage be solemnized by a Lawful Minister of the word, that he may counsel them and pray for them*; In the said directory, care also is taken, *that before any marriage the persons intent of marriage be published by the Minister three several sabbath days in the congregation at the place, or places of their most usual and constant abode respectively, and all Ministers are to have sufficient testimony of this publication before they proceed to solemnize Marriage*. By the Liturgy also sufficient provision is made that of all that are to be married, the Bannes be published in the Church, three several sundays, or Holy days in the time of Divine service, but any one, that hath mony may have a licence to be Married without any such publication of Bannes, by which means great inconveniencies have arisen in Church and State. Care also is taken by the 62 Canon of 1603. "That none shall be married, unless the Parents, or Governors of the parties to be married being under the age of twenty one, shall either personally, or by sufficient testimony, signifie their consent given to the said marriage. The directory is somewhat more strict, requiring, *that persons though of age shall be bound to have a Certificate of their*

*their Parents consent, if it be their first marriage:* And really it seems but rational, that a man and a woman, though of the age of Thirty, if never married before, should be bound to signify their Parents consent, before any Minister adventure to marry them.

The greatest differences I find among Protestants about Marriage, are reducible to Two Heads:

1. We say here in England, *That though Children be bound to ask the consent of Parents, yet if the marriage be made, no such consent asked or obtained, the marriage is valid; fieri non debet, factum valet,* is our Rule; but beyond Seas, such marriages are by many held to be void and of no effect. Mr. D. hath so many obligations laid on him by our Church, that it would be but gratitude to take her part, and to answer the Arguments of Dissenters.

2. Our Church hath thought meet to prohibit marriage for certain times and seasons, which are particularized in our common Almanacks. Other Churches leave it free to persons to marry all the year about, to these the Presbyterians joyn themselves, they say marriage is not to be forbidden at any time, unless on such days, in which God calls to fasting, weeping, mourning; to confirm them in this opinion, they had the judgment of a whole Convocation in England assembled in the year 1575, agreeing, *That Bishops should take order that it be published and declared in every Parish Church within their Diocesses, that marriage might be solemnized at all times of the year; but though the Church thought meet to put this Article into*  
the

the Book, the Head of the Church, *Q. Elizabeth*, did not so think, and therefore suffered it not to be Printed. *Dr. Heyl. Hist. of Presb. 282, 283.*

*Object. Ay, but there are some who scruple the Ring in Marriage, which Mr. D. saith is used in Hessen, Poland, Lithuania.*

*Sol.* If there be any such, the more is the pity, for rational ground of scruple there is none, any more than there is to scruple taking seisin by a Turf: Nor do I know any one *Presbyterian* now living, that doth scruple the use of a Ring in Marriage.

*Pag. 48.* we are informed by *Mr. D.* That in most places of the Reformed Churches, they have Funeral Sermons, in Hungary and Transilvania, two or three, in Bohemia but one, and that at the Grave. As if he would suggest to us, that either *Presbyterians* are against Funeral Sermons, or the *Episcopal* extremely for them; whereas the truth is, there never were more Funeral Sermons than in those days, when the *Presbyterians* had their Churches and Pulpits; and now that they are thrust out, when any one of them dye, 'tis seldom but some body is hired to Preach a Sermon, I say, hired, for they are as rare as Black Swans, that will Preach a Funeral Sermon under an Angel or a Noble. And whereas he tells us, *ibid.* of the Minister with singing Boys going before the Corps; he knows, that in England we have singing Boys but in few places, scarce any where but in Cathedrals, which do not use to send their singing Boys to go before the Corps at every Funeral.

Civil

Civil respects, or differences at Burials may be suted to the rank and condition of the party deceased; whiles he was living; as for the Religious part of Funerals, why should it not be alike to all that have attained like precious faith? Doth Mr. D. know any Churches where only the moneyed Christians are honoured with Sermons; the poor being laid in their graves without any? If he did not, why would he lay open the nakedness of his Fathers, why would he tempt strangers to think, that with them there is respect of persons? The Scots say, Either let us have Sermons at all Funerals, or at none, so say the *Hollanders*, so I suppose the *French* either say or think: But Mr. D. Page 49. quotes a scrap of a Letter from Monsieur *Drelin-court* saying, *I am so far from allowing the custom of the Reformed Churches of this Kingdom, where the Ministers are silent at dead mens Burials, that I would think it unsufferable were it not for the condition under which we live.* I believe Mr. *Drelin-court*, if he be still alive, thinks Mr. D. dealt not civilly with him, in publishing this piece of his Letter, for he sure took no delight to let the world know, that he accounted the custom of the *Holland Churches* unsufferable, especially seeing the *French Churches* in *Holland* comply with them, and yet cannot plead that they fear persecution. The same *Drelin-court*, if we may believe Mr. D. said, that he found upon perusal of the Common Prayer Book office for Burial of the dead, *nothing that was contrary to piety, or pure Doctrine, and the service of God.*

Is not this a rare commendation of the Liturgy; that it hath nothing in it contrary to piety, &c. But what Common prayer Book did this learned Divine read over? in all but this last there were expressions to be used at Burials, that were apt to harden men in their impenitence, which therefore are now either changed, or left quite out. At present I know little liable to exception, save only, that Burial seems appropriated to a Priest: may a Deacon Baptise and Preach, and may he not bury our dead out of our sight? In the Old Liturgy, it was said, *the Minister meeting the Corps at the Church stile shall say*; in this last edition of the Liturgy it is said *the Priests and Clerks*; and so throughout the whole Office we have no other word but *Priest*, which is never applied to any that are but Deacons; there is some mystery in this which Mr. D. can expound, or else take no notice of. 2. By the Liturgy the form of Burial is not to be used *for any that dye unbaptized*. What's the meaning of this? If Christian Parents lose a child before they can get it to be baptized, must they, to all other their sorrow, have this also added, That their child shall not have Christian burial? Shall the Idolatrous Papists child be buried, and shall the child of the *Antipadobaptist* not be buried according to the Liturgy? How will Mr. Tombs, after all the pains he hath taken to defend the Liturgy, brook this? 3. Seeing the Office is to be read at the burial of all baptized, being neither excommunicate nor murderers of themselves; why is the Priest appointed to say, *His hope is that every one who is buried, rests in the Lord*: What if a

man be killed in bed with another's Wife? What if he be killed in a Duel, or in an Alehouse half drunk? What if he be by God struck dead with an oath or blasphemy upon his tongues end? must we use the very same words for him, that we use for one that led a most Christian life, and died a comfortable death? I have much more charity for some that laid violent hands on themselves, than for those who contrary to all laws of God and man, do dye in Duels by the sword of another?

Pag. 50. he hath other words of *Drelincourts* as little to purpose, *If we were permitted*, saith he, *to preach at Paris, and there to minister the holy communion, I am of this perswasion, that it would be a pious and charitable work to give that comfort to those poor sick persons who have kept their bed for many years, and are not able to go as far as Charenton, which is the place of our ordinary exercises of Religion.* This is a marvellous wary speech, 1. *If they were permitted.* 2. *If they were permitted both to preach and administer the Sacrament.* 3. Then, *it would be pious and charitable to give the Communion to such as have kept their beds for many years.* Can *Mr. D.* think that the *English Presbyterians* will be offended at a perswasion thus qualified? It may rather be questioned, Whether some of them would not judge it charitable and pious to administer the Sacrament in such cases, though they had no permission from the King; at least it may be conceived, that they would adventure, if they should be permitted only to administer the Sacrament, though no leave were given them to preach; for a Sermon is not of the essence of a Sacrament; and



and I deem they would perform this act of charity and piety to such as had been confined to their beds, though only for one or two years, which are not many. There is not one word in all the Directory against private Communion.

P. 40. Mr. D. gives us notice, *That in the Bohemian Churches, the people do alway say Amen at the end of the Prayers, in the same manner that we do here in England.* Which is so far from crossing the *Presbyterians*, that they, as many think, by their good will, would have the people say nothing but *Amen*.

P. 39. he fancieth he may put the *Presbyterians* to silence, by telling them of Churches that sing *Hymns and spiritual songs, besides Psalms.* But he may know, that *Presbyterians* are as much at liberty to sing any godly Hymn or spiritual Song, as he himself is. Let him but procure the *Te Deum* or the Lords prayer to be set to ordinary tunes, and then he shall see whether the *Presbyterians* will make any scruple for conscience-sake to sing those forms, or the three Creeds which are said to be set with musical notes in the *French and Dutch Churches*, but not sung by the *French Churches*, by reason both the Rhime and the language are something course and old. *Presbyterians* are not so dainty, they continue to sing the old *Psalms*, though the language and rhime be odd and uncouth in many places.

P. 183. he goes about to stab the *Presbyterians* with a declaration of a National Synod met at *Figeac* 1579. What is the declaration? Why, it is a declaration against reading verses aloud before they

be sung, as being inept, threatening censure to such Churches as used it. The Presbyterians think this custom unfit, and therefore exhorted all Congregations to get Psalm-books, and to learn to read; they allowed reading of Psalms line by line, only for necessity, when ignorance had prevailed so far, that many in most Congregations could not read at all. Let Mr. D. but take care that all be taught to read, or learn the psalms without book, and I dare half undertake for Presbyterians, they shall leave off so inept or unmeet a custom. Till then, they, and Episcopal men too, must do as they can, and remember that they are debtors to the unwise as well as wise.

P. 22. Mr. D. makes mention of Churches, whose Ministers wear commonly either a long cloak, or a gown and long cap; nay, Calvin (saith he) did wear a gown and a cap, as often as he taught either in the Divinity-School, or in the Church at Geneva. If Presbyterians do not wear a cap when they teach in the church, they may easily be pardoned by Mr. D. As for a gown, let him but get them liberty to preach, and they will promise never to need his pardon for want of that. I am sure I have seen those whom the Parliament sent down to Cambridge into the places of such as were ejected, preach both in gowns and hoods, and so I have heard they did at Oxford when they preached Latin Sermons; for which they have been scolded at by silly women, as Calvin was by the Wife of Frumen-  
tius.

I had almost forgot another Impertinence, p. 37. The French Churches require that the Ministers, who

wh  
are  
pra  
nisi  
Th  
as t  
I h  
the  
Oro  
ince  
ove  
"C  
"g  
"cl  
"th  
"m  
"or  
"po  
the  
Ger  
Cha  
man  
of h  
Gole  
mean  
do f  
upon  
ed h  
all  
Ten  
wha  
also  
mann

who ought to use Imposition of hands, upon those that are to be admitted to the ministry among them, should pray standing on that occasion, the new received Minister and the Congregation kneeling at the same time. This was the constant practice of the *Presbyterians*, as to Ordainers and Ordained, in all places where I have been, or of which I have heard. As for the people, they were commonly so numerous at Ordinations, that they could not without huge inconvenience kneel. I also find that I have passed over something, page 32. "They have the Ten Commandments in Letters of Gold upon two great Tables where they are able to be at the charge of it; and in some places they have also the Creed and the Lords Prayer in the same manner, conformable to one of the constitutions of the Church of *England* to the same purpose. Who are meant by *they*, I cannot tell; the precedent words were, in Princes Chappels in *Germany*, and other parts they have them (*i. e.* Chalices) gilt. Are there any Princes in *Germany* or other parts who cannot be at the charge of having the Ten Commandments in Letters of Gold upon two great Tables? Or doth Mr. *D.* mean the *French* Churches, as many as have ability, do set up the Commandments in Letters of Gold upon two great Tables? If so, I doubt he wronged his Conscience. But let it be supposed that in all *French* Churches that are not very poor, the Ten Commandments are set up in Letters of Gold, what mean those words, in some places they have also the Creed and the Lords Prayer in the same manner, conformable to one of the constitutions of

the Church of *England*? Have the rich *French* Churches, the Lords Prayer and Creed on two Tables, and in Letters of Gold? If they have not, why is it said that they have the Creed and Lords Prayer in the same manner? The Churches of *France* I am certain may be conformable enough to the constitution of the Church of *England*, and yet not have either the Commandments in Two Tables or in Letters of Gold; for all the constitution requires, is but *that the Ten Commandments be set upon the East-end of every Church and Chappel, where the people may best see and read the same, and other chosen sentences written upon the walls of the said Churches and Chappels in convenient places.* Here is no mention of two great Tables, no mention of Letters of Gold, no mention of Creed or Lords Prayer.

But why did Mr. *D.* trouble himself to bring in all, or any of this Stuff? Did *Presbyterians* ever deny the lawfulness or expedience of having either the Decalogue, or Creed, or Lords Prayer, set upon conspicuous places in the Temple? I know an eminent Nonconformist now living, who was wont to rejoyce that the Painter had set the Lords Prayer just over against his Pulpit, that if it had hapned he had been out, he might by his eyes help himself. Had the Creed been so placed it had been well for Mr. *D.* for they say, that not long since, he was horribly out in repeating the Articles of Faith after Sermon.

I shall conclude this Catalogue of Impertinencies with Mr. *D.*'s stories concerning reformed Churches, that keep the very same Temples that were used

in

in time of Popery, pag. 28. so did the *Fresbyterians*, and Mr. *Paget* hath defended the lawfulness of using such places against the frivolous exceptions of Mr. *Ainsworth*; and now let the world judge, whether Mr. *D.* deserve not to be called and accounted Mr. *Impertinent*.

I must come to a third part of my task, which will be perhaps necessary, but is somewhat more unpleasing than any of the other, *viz.* to muster up some of those Speeches of Mr. *Dwrell*, which Countrey-men call *Wiskers*, you may call them by another name, but will not know how to excuse, except by the English Proverb, that *Travellers may* — by authority.

Pag. 8. *Bellarmino* was an eye-witness in his time, much against his will, of *Oecolampadius* his being called Bishop of the Church of *Basil*: *Oecolampadius* on his Tomb in *Basil*, is called *Templi hujus verus Episcopus*. *Bellarmino* in his fourth Book, *De notis Eccle. cap. 8.* saith, That when he was at *Basil*, he read him, called on his Tomb, the first Bishop of that City, which is a Lye; but then he also saith, that he read this, *non sine risu*, if these words do not signifie, much against his will, where is Mr. *D.*'s veracity?

Pag. 13. All understanding men amongst the French say plainly, That if God Almighty were pleased, that all France should embrace the Reformed Religion, as England hath, the Episcopal Government must be established in their Churches. Do all understanding men say this, and say it plainly? I shall manifest the contrary ere I have done, and indeed have manifested it already.

Pag. 16. He dreads not to affirm, *That Smeetymnuus and all Smeetymnuus being bound most of them by their Oath to use set forms, never use them.* S. M. T. Y. when Mr. D. Printed this, were dead, and so not bound by Oath to use set forms; as for E. C. M. N. W. S. who were then alive, how will it be proved that either they were bound by Oath to use set forms, or that they never used them?

The *Smeetymnuus*, if by them he mean the Non-conformists (and whom else can he mean) were never the most of them by Oath bound to use set forms, and yet sometimes some of them have used them, yea did use them at that very time when Mr. D. was hammering out this Book.

Pag. 18. *There is not one Minister in all France, but hath made unto himself a set form which he useth always and no other.* What confidence is this! hath he received Letters from every Minister in France, or spoke with every Minister in France? Hath he certain knowledg that every Minister made a form unto himself? did never any use a form that he had learned from another? did never any make to himself above one form? I must needs doubt there is untruth in this, till I see the thing proved under the hands of all Ministers in France.

Pag. 22. *In Hungaria and Transilvania, Ministers never go abroad without their long Cloak and Cassock just as here.* Here, I am sure, Ministers go abroad without long Cloak and Cassock, and are by the Canons of the Church allowed so to do. *Si non caste, tamen caute.*

“Page 26. speaking of the *fratres Bohemi*, and  
 “the *Moravians* ’tis said, that they have days for  
 “commemoration of the Blessed Virgin, and of  
 “the Holy Apostles, and other Saints and Mar-  
 “tyrs, as also one for the commemoration of all  
 “the Saints ; all which days they keep after the  
 “same manner, that they are kept here in *England*  
 “according to the Ecclesiastical constitutions, and  
 “common use of the Church. I suppose the *Bohe-*  
*mians* and *Moravians* were to have Sermons on  
 Holy days, are we bound to have any? They are  
 not appointed to fast the Eves of any Saints days,  
 but so are we ; they are not ordered on the Saints  
 days to cease from the works of their callings,  
 but so are we, and are punishable with severity  
 enough if we do not.

“Page 27. mention being made of the *Helvetic*  
 confession, and of the Holy days commended by it,  
 ’tis said it was *subscribed by the Kirk of Scotland*,  
 1566. *The Ministers of that Church being then of a*  
*different judgment from what their successors have*  
*shewed of late years*, which is a most egregious  
 falshood, for the *Kirk* then discovered her dislike  
 of the festivals appointed, or commended in the  
 Confession of *Helvetia*, and so have the Ministers  
 of late years, so as they concur in judgment fully  
 as to this matter, and I believe in every thing  
 else.

“Page 28. *Crosses have not been pulled down from*  
*the top of Churches unless in some popular tumults.*  
 The Latin Apologist hath shewen the falsity of  
 this.

“Page

“Page 29. The *fratres Bohemi* have their solemn dedication of Churches, which ceremony is to be performed with them by the Bishop, in the same manner, as with us here in *England*. The manner of dedication of Churches is not here agreed upon in *England*, nor is there any Law that requires dedications, and some places we have that never were dedicated, and the ceremonies used in dedication with us are such as are not used in *Bohemia*.

“Page 30. At *Basil*, and *Breme*, they have their Fonts of stone and use them for the Baptism of Infants; by which we see, that they are not of the same judgment with the Directorians who find Popery and Superstition in the very placing of them. All the Directory saith is, *that Baptism is to be administred in the face of the Congregation, where the people may most conveniently hear, and see, and not in the places where Fonts in the time of Popery were unfitly, and superstitiously placed.* Are the Fonts at *Basil*, and *Breme*, placed where the people cannot hear and see? Are they placed unfitly, as in times of Popery? if they be, I see not how they can justify themselves; if they be not, how can we see that the Divines of *Basil* and *Breme* are of a different mind about the placing of Fonts, from the Directorians?

“Page 31. I know none that did ever so much as move the question in what place and which way the Communion table ought to stand, (so it be seated where the people may see and hear) except the new *Scotch* and *English* Presbyterians.

Either



Either his knowledg is very small, or else he did write this against his knowledg, and conscience.

Page 30. *In all Reformed Churches men use to enter into the place of publick Worship with their Hats off.* If this be meant of such times in which the congregation is performing publick Worship, the *Presbyterians* do so, and are enjoyned by the Directory so to do; but if it be meant, of entring at all times, and upon all occasions, it is known to be an untruth to all that have been in *Holland*. The Divines there would laugh to see any so superstitious as to pull off his Hat every time he hath occasion to go through one of their Temples.

*Ibid.* In France the women that are persons of quality unmask themselves, and the devoutest sort both of men and women use to kneel and make a short Prayer for Gods blessing on the service they come to perform, before they sit down; yet the Directory though it pretendeth conformity with them, prohibiteth these very things. If the French Ladies unmask themselves to shew that they are not ashamed to be seen at Protestant Assemblies, what Directorian is he that will blame them? But if by so unmasking themselves they design to shew their beauty, &c. then there is something in the 1 Cor. 11. that they may do well to think of. The Directory forbids not private Prayers for Gods blessing, unless any come in when the service of God is begun, and if the devouter sort of men and women in France are wont to fall on their knees, when the congregation is singing, &c. the Directory pretends not conformity with them, they may do well

well to consider, that God is the God of Order, and not of Confusion; an ejaculation in such cases, is as much as can be needful, provided it be joyned with shame, or trouble for coming so late.

Page 37. *In the Churches of Poland and Lithuania, and likewise in them of Transylvania and Hungaria the people useth alway to say the Prayers aloud after the Minister just as we do in the Church of England. Such was also the use of the Churches of the Unity of the fratres Bohemi.*

Our people do not much use to say the Prayers after the Minister, that is certain, except the Clerk be the people, and there are but few Prayers they are enjoined to repeat after him, the Lords prayer is appointed to be said not after, but with him. What the use of the *fratres Bohemi* was, I do not well know, nor hath Mr. D. directed me how I may inform my self. But I have met with something in Bishop *Amos Comenius* which I commend to the diligent consideration of Mr. D. and all others that are zealous in this matter; it is in his Annotations on the *Ratio Disciplina Ordinifq; &c.* Page 100. 'The Ritual Books (the forms of performing the sacred Ministries which they call *Agenda*) are not with us appended to the Catechetical Books, so as to come into the hands of the Common people, but being put forth by themselves, are given only to the Pastors, not privately in a corner, but in the sight of the Church. After the death of the Pastor the same Books are put into the hands of the Seniors. Some one will say what superstition is this? *Ans.* Let others have their liberty of judging: I do not

' not think things are so to be managed, that no-  
 ' thing mystical (to be rather adored by the peo-  
 ' ple, than proudly to be looked on, and after-  
 ' wards vilely esteemed) should be left to the  
 ' Priests. Religion rejoyceth in veils: And our  
 ' chief Master himself was wont to speak some  
 ' things to his disciples by themselves. The Apostle  
 ' when he commands Bishop *Timothy to commit some*  
 ' *things to faithful men who are apt to teach others,*  
 ' 2 *Tim. 2. 2.* doth he not intimate a certain dis-  
 ' ference, betwixt these things that are given to  
 ' all, and those that are given to the Teachers of  
 ' others? Certainly the word *ὑποτίθησθαι*, which  
 ' he useth signifieth, to commit or concredit some  
 ' thing singular. And when we read it written of  
 ' Christ, that having read the sacred Text, and  
 ' laid aside his Book, he began his speech so, that  
 ' all fixing their eyes on him, admired the words  
 ' that flowed from his mouth; do we think these  
 ' things happen otherwise to others? *viz.* If words  
 ' flow from the mouth of Gods messenger not seen  
 ' before, that the hearers are rendred more attent  
 ' and more profound admirers of the grace of God.  
 ' For if prescribed things only be always recited,  
 ' what will there be to excite attention? Curiosity  
 ' rather will be excited, whilst this and the other  
 ' by beholding the same things in his Books attend-  
 ' eth whether they be accurately read, what place  
 ' is here for devotion? Neither is it to be thought  
 ' that ours are bound to the Books delivered to them,  
 ' to words and syllables, it is free to them to use any  
 ' thing drawn out of the treasures of mystical wisdom  
 ' which make to excite zeal according to variety of  
 occasions.

‘ occasions. Whence it comes to pass that Godly  
 ‘ hearers are scarce ever present at Sacred my-  
 ‘ steries without new motion of heart.

Page 61. *It is said that the Reformed Churches  
 beyond the Seas, take those things in which they  
 differ from the Reformed Church of England, to be  
 sinful, and that therefore they would have her con-  
 form to them.*

By whom is this said in such indefinite terms as  
 are here made use of? I doubt it will be found  
 that none have so said, at least none that are called  
 or accounted *Presbyterians*; and if none can be  
 found, what opinion will the world have of Mr.  
*D's* veracity? But if any have said that some re-  
 formed Churches abroad have accounted some  
 things in which the *English* Church differs from  
 them to be sinful, it is a thing so manifest that I  
 wonder Mr. *D.* can find a forehead to deny it.  
 He mentioneth in this place the Reformed Churches  
 in the Electorate of *Brandenburg*, and I do not ob-  
 serve him to have mentioned them any where else,  
 I suppose (by the Churches he joyneth them with)  
 that he meaneth such as close with that Reforma-  
 tion that the Elector himself affecteth, and would  
 fain have introduced, and it will not be amiss to  
 let our Countrymen understand what that is. The  
 heads of it are recited in the Continuation of  
*Thuanus* at the year 1614. Page 396, 397. *Edis.*  
*Francof.* 1628.

‘ 1. Images, Crosses, Statues, are to be removed  
 ‘ out of Churches.

‘ 2. Altars remaining since Popery, and built to  
 ‘ perform the Sacrifice of the Mass, are to be taken  
 ‘ away,

'away, and in place of them are to be put oblong  
'wooden Tables covered with black cloth, a linnen  
'cloth when the Supper is to be administred, being  
'put upon it.

'3. Instead of Hosts, Wafers are to be used,  
'which being cut into long pieces, should be receiv-  
'ed and broken by the hands of those who come to  
'the Lords Table.

'4. That instead of Chalice used in Mass,  
'Cups should be used in the administration of the  
'Lords Supper.

'5. The *Cassiola* ( which may very well signifie  
'the Surplice, as well as other Vestments ) are  
'to be left to the Popish Priests.

'6. No linnen is to be put under, or offer'd to  
'those who come to the Lords Table ; nor are they  
'to kneel as if Christ were corporally present.

'7. The sign of the Cross is not to be added at  
'the end of the benediction.

'8. The Ministers of the Gospel are not to turn  
'the back to men.

'9. Prayers and Epistles are not to be sung be-  
'fore Sermon, but read.

'10. Auricular Confession is to be left off.

'11. At the Name of Jesus knees are not to be  
'bowed, or head uncovered.

'12. Prayers in the Pulpit are not to be mutter-  
'ed, but pronounced with a loud voice.

'13. The Supper of the Lord is not for fear of  
'danger to be administred to sick persons, especi-  
'ally when the plague is abroad.

'14. Stone-Fountains are to be removed, and Ba-  
'fons substituted in their rooms.

'15. The

' 15. The Decalogue is not to be recited imper-  
'fect, but intire.

' 16. The Catechism in some things that are ex-  
'traneous, is to be amended.

' 17. The Sacred Trinity ( a mystery to be ado-  
'red, and ineffable ) is not to be represented by a-  
'ny images either carved or painted.

' 18. The words of the holy Supper are to be  
'interpreted by Sacramental analogy, and collation  
'of other places of holy Scripture.

' 19. To the Gospels and Epistles which are ex-  
'plained on Lords days, and yearly repeated, Mi-  
'nisters ought not so to be bound, that they may  
'not instead of them, read and preach upon any  
'other notable Text of the Bible:

Dr. Heylin hath exemplified the heads of this  
designed Reformation, on purpose to show, as he  
tells us, *Hist. of Presby.* 412. how *Calvinian* and  
*Lutheran* Churches differ, and how near ours ap-  
proacheth to the latter; and I have exemplified  
them to shew, that if Ceremonies be but gnats,  
*English Presbyterians* are not the only persons that  
do strain at them; declaring also my just abhor-  
rence of the Historians impudence in ascribing the  
designment of this Reformation to the plots and pra-  
ctices of a subtil Lady.

P. 85. Mr. D. having before recited a Letter of  
Mr. Chabrets, in which he makes a question whe-  
ther the Liturgy received at the *Savoy* Congrega-  
tion, be the same that was used in *Q. Eliz.* King  
*James*, or King *Charles I.*'s time, or another compi-  
led by Archbishop *Land*, that had been occasion  
of

of much trouble, 'adds words of great reproach  
'against those who accused the late Lord Archbi-  
'shop of making a new Book of Common-prayer,  
'other than those that were used in the times of our  
'last three Sovereigns: this he makes a thing that  
'never was.

But he is now to know, that Archbishop *Land*  
did make, or cause to be made, a Common-prayer-  
book for the Kirk of *Scotland*, different in many  
things from any that had been used here in *Eng-  
land*, in any of the three last Sovereigns Reigns;  
which Common-prayer-book, among other things,  
occasioned great disturbances betwixt the two  
Kingdoms: nay, he made some alterations in the  
Liturgy for *England*, that were not very pleasing  
to some palates among the sons of the Church;  
what they were, if Mr. *D.* pleaseth he may see in  
Mr. *Prynnes* Epistle Dedicatory to his *Quench-  
coal*. It is not for such a poor creature as I am, to  
blame or find fault with those alterations, which I  
find imitated in our last edition of the Liturgy.  
*Only I wonder why in the Office for the Fifth of No-  
vember Ministers are not directed to read the Sta-  
tute for the observing of that day, seeing it is by law  
appointed to be read.*

*Ibid.* He complains that our *Convocations* are be-  
yond seas represented to consist only of *Archbi-  
shops and Bishops*; and that the inferior *Clergy* is  
not permitted to sit and vote in them. Really if any  
gave such information, he was but too like to Mr.  
*D.* speaking of that which he either did not, or  
would not understand. The *Convocations* of *Eng-  
land* do consist of an upper and lower House; and  
G  
though

though the Upper House consists but of Archbishops and Bishops, yet the Lower consists of the inferior Clergy, Deans, Prebendaries, Archdeacons and Proctors of the Clergy. P. 116. Mr. D. calls our Convocations *a Council consisting of above sixscore reverend, grave, and learned Divines, chosen out of many thousands, whereof twenty-six are Archbishops and Bishops, a greater number Deans, and Prebends, and Archdeacons*: Which shews he understandeth not the frame and constitution of our Convocations, though they be the Church-Representative, that he pretends to write for. The Convocation for the very Province of *Canterbury*, (besides which, there is one for the Province of *York*) consists of an Archbishop, twenty-one Bishops for the Upper House; the Lower House consists of Deans twenty-two, Prebendaries twenty-four, Archdeacons fifty-four, Clerks representing the Clergy, forty-four; so that the very Lower House for this one Province, consists of One hundred forty-four persons. But how *these are chosen out of many thousands, they are men of rare faculties that can understand*. If we speak of the members of Convocation, neither Bishops, nor Deans, nor Archdeacons, are chosen to it, but come of course, just as Peers do to the House of Lords. As for the Prebends, they are chosen only by the Chapters, which I hope are not many thousands; the Diocesan Clergy may be said to be chosen out of many thousands; but they for the Province of *Canterbury* are but forty-four. It may be Mr. D. meant that these Divines are chosen to their Dignities out of many thousands; but that will be a grosser

gro  
ch  
to  
tho  
nate  
Cha  
the  
aff  
con  
Pur  
qual  
amp  
Cler  
shou  
carry  
Bishe  
are t  
were  
on th  
cells;  
one a  
Bishe  
Episc  
so m  
he, &  
vince.  
Conve  
conce  
and d  
as the  
vince  
hund  
Fifty



grosser untruth than the other: for Bishops are chosen by the Dean and Chapter of that Church to which they are sent, but they have not many thousands to chuse out of; there is but one nominated to be chosen, and him I believe the Dean and Chapter must chuse, and return his Election; and the Election being returned and ratified by Royal assent, the Metropolitan must either consecrate or confirm, as occasion requireth. That which the *Puritans* were wont to complain of, was the inequality of the Representative; they say for example, If all who are chosen by the Diocesan Clergy for the whole Province of *Canterbury*, should desire a Reformation, yet they could not carry it; because the Arch-deacons who are the Bishops creatures, as being chosen solely by them, are ten in number more than they; and they also were wont to say, That the Bishops would take on them to nominate the two Clerks for the Diocess; and if it be so, they said it was in effect all one as if the Convocation had consisted only of Bishops. This notwithstanding, Dr. *Taylor* in his *Episcopacy asserted*, seems to envy the Presbyters so much as sitting in Councils: *'Tis evident, saith he, Episc. assert. p. 283. ) that the Laws of Provinces, and of the Catholick Church, were made by Conventions of Bishops, without the intervening or concurrence of Presbyters, or any else, for sentence and decision; the instances of this are just as many as there are Councils.* The parishes of both Provinces in *England*, are above nine thousand two hundred; the pastors of these parishes send about Fifty-two to represent them, and in the very House

where they sit, there are above twice as many (in whose election they were no way concerned) that have equal votes with them; and besides, there is an Upper House of Bishops. Mr. Durell would exceed *Plutarch* himself, if he could find in any Reformed Church a parallel. Let him try how such a Synod as this will hit with that which the *Theses of Saumur* say concerning Councils.

But I have almost forgotten my self. Let Mr. D. go on to wipe off false aspersions cast on our Bishops. P. 86. *Men beyond the seas are told that every one of our Bishops is a Pope, nay more than a Pope in his Diocese; prescribing and imposing of himself what he pleaseth to his Clergy; whereas every Bishops authority is limited by his subscription to the 39 articles, &c. by the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, and by the Laws of the Land, according to the prescript whereof he is to rule his diocese, and no otherwise; calling always to joyn with him in imposition of hands, and other matters of weighty concernment, some of the Prebends of his Cathedral, or other grave Ministers of the Diocese.* Certainly this Preacher knows not what a Pope is, if he think that what these calumniators report of the Bishops, makes them worse than Popes. But let them deserve to keep the Whetstone for their tale, Mr. D. will have it from them again; for nothing is more false, than that by any Constitutions or Laws Bishops are bound to call unto them either Prebends or grave Ministers to joyn with them in imposition of hands, and in all other weighty matters. The Bishops lay on hands in confirmation of children, who is to joyn with him in that Imposition?

tion? They lay on hands when they ordain Deacons, are they to call any to joyn with them in that imposition of hands?

Ay, but they cannot ordain a Presbyter regularly, unless some Presbyters joyn with them in laying on of hands.

Really they cannot: but now the question is, What the hands of the Presbyters signifie? And truly if we ask those that stickle for Hierarchy, they will say, they signifie just nothing, or next to nothing: this conjunction of Presbyters is not *ad essentiam operis*, but *ad dignitatem sacerdotii*. The Presbyters hands confer nothing of the power of Order upon the party ordained, but only testifie their consent unto the business, and approbation of the man. So Dr. Heylin History of Episcopacy, p. 162. and to the same purpose Dr. Taylor in Episcopacy asserted. Is not the Presbytery fairly advanced? it may do what the Laity did, or at least may do, testifie consent and approbation of the man? Again, the suspension of a Minister is a weighty thing; who is appointed to joyn with the Bishop in this? Excommunication also is a weighty thing; Who must joyn with the Bishop in that? Finally, Mr. D. would oblige me greatly if he would fully satisfie me what Canons and Constitutions the Bishops are to govern their Clergy by. I hope no Canons are in force but those of 1603. which I am sure are more than be well observed; but there were Legatine Canons in number Seventy-seven, made by *Otho* and *Othobone*; and Provincial Canons made under *Stephen Langthon* and *Henry Chichly* Archbishops of Canterbury,

terbury, digested into a body by *William Lindwood*, as the former were by *John Mon*, Canon of *Lincoln*; and some say, that so much of all these Canons as is not contrary to the Laws and Customs of the Land, is still in force; if so, as so it may be for ought I know, then I am sure a great many of the Clergy know not how they are to be governed; but if any should know all Canons and Constitutions, and understand that the Bishop prescribes things contrary to all Law and Canons, what then? Why then there lyes an Appeal, or a Prohibition may be obtained, to the cost of neither of which a poor Countrey-Vicar can easily raise his purse.

P. 87. *Mr. D.* is at his old trade of over-reaching: for he describeth *Monsieur Goyon* to be a man as well versed in antiquity, as is possible.

Yet neither he nor I can tell the bounds of possibility in the skill of antiquity; and perhaps both of us can tell of some that are more skilful in Church-History than this *Monsieur*.

P. 103. The Church of *England* is be-lied, for  
 'of her it is said, that she holdeth subordination  
 'of Ministers in the Christian Church, to be of A-  
 'postolical, nay of Divine Institution, having (as  
 'she conceiveth) for grounds of this her judgment,  
 'beside Scripture, the practice of the holy Apo-  
 'stles in their times, of the Universal Church ever  
 'since, until this latter age; and which is more, of  
 'Christ himself, who ordained the Apostles and the  
 'Seventy, in an imparity, as two distinct Orders  
 'of Ministers in his Church; yet notwithstand-  
 'ing she doth but simply assert the lawfulness of  
 'her own Government.

Cer-

Certainly this man doth not pretend to know the conceptions of our Church, till they be discovered; and the Church hath no where declared her conceptions to be these, *That subordination of Ministers, beside Scripture, is grounded on the practice of the Apostles, and of Christ himself.* The practice of the Apostles, and of Christ, is not beside Scripture, but recorded in Scripture; nor doth the Church any where say that Christ instituted the Apostles and the Seventy as two distinct Orders of Ministers in his Church; if she do, then Dr. Hammond did not know her mind, or else plainly contradicts her.

P. 144. contains no fewer than four calumnies against *Presbyterians*, which must be manifested in their order.

1. *The Presbyterians had no set-forms, nor indeed would receive any, whether for Common-prayer or for administration of Sacraments, Matrimony, &c.*

I believe some *Presbyterians* had set-forms for all these; and I am sure they do not account it unlawful to receive set-forms for any of these, only they may, and some of them do judge it inexpedient to have Ministers so tied up in all these, as never in the least to vary, either by addition or subtraction. I never heard of *Presbyterian* that administered Baptism in any other form of words than those appointed in the Liturgy. *I baptize in the Name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; nor the Lords Supper in any other form of words but what is Scriptural; nor Marriage but in a set-form, either that in the Common-prayer-book, or that in the Directory.

2. For a long time many of them had left off the use of that very form our Lord hath taught us, p. 37. He had said, That most, if not all Directorians, had left out of their Service, for a long time, that most complete, most divine form of prayer.

Mr. *Pager*, Mr. *Ball*, Mr. *Hodges*, have printed Apologies for the use of the Lords prayer; hundreds of those who now suffer deprivation, have thousands of witnesses that they have used it in their Churches and in their Families, on Sundays, on Fasting-days, and yet they must have this filth thrown into their dish. However, on this occasion let us try what Mr. *D.* can say: Suppose some Presbyterians had never used this prayer in the Pulpit, but only at the Lords Supper, had they not president in the ancient Church to justify them in so doing? yea, suppose some should say that it were no sin never to use this prayer, provided a man took it as the pattern of his prayer, how would Mr. *D.* stop their mouths, and prove them transgressors? In his Sermon p. 26. he brings the words *Luke 11. When ye pray, say*; and this place is commonly urged, but perhaps is not so strong as some imagine it to be, at least when managed as they manage it: for I ask, What is the meaning of, *When ye pray, say*? Is the meaning, *When ye pray, say after this manner*, or *say these words*? If but *after this manner*, then the sword is not long enough to reach Mr. *Ainsworth* and his disciples, for they pretend to say after that manner, (and not to conceal any part of the truth, the Syriack translation in *Luke* requires it to be rendered, sic, or *ad hunc modum estote dicentes*); but

let

let the words mean, *say these words*, then I ask, Whether the words in *St. Matthew*, or *St. Luke*?

If the words that occur in *Luke*, then we have no precept for the Doxology, as it is in *Matthew*. And really I have wondred what they meant, who were wont to say at the conclusion of their Pulpit-prayers, *In his name and in his words we further pray, saying as he hath taught us*; and yet had never satisfied themselves, that the Doxology which they constantly in that case used, was of our Lords own inditing. There is reason (saith Dr. Hammond) to believe that the words of Doxology came in out of the Greek Liturgies; and that the ancientest Greek Copies have them not. *Præf. Cat. lib. 3. sect. 2. Grotius* had said as much before. Those who believe these two Learned men, had need alter the form of words with which they usher in the Lords Prayer. 'Tis not safe to ascribe to Christ any thing but what is his; but how shall a man know that the copies in which the Doxology is wanting, are the most ancient?

*Erasmus* saith he found the Doxology in all the Greek Copies: *Lucas Brugensis*, that it was in all the Greek *Parisian* Copies but one. And if one look into the various readings collected in our late *Polyglot* Bibles, he shall find the Copies that want these words of Doxology, to be but few; wherefore *Grotius* hath got no credit by saying, *Seeing that they are not extant in the most ancient Greek Copies, but are extant in the Syriack, Arabick, and Latin Context, we may learn not only that the Arabick and Latin Version, but also the Syriack, was made after that the Liturgy of the Churches was brought*

brought into a certain form. For the Doxology is not in some *Arabick* Versions, not in that which is inserted into the *Polyglot* Bibles. If the *Syriack* and *Arabick* (which *Grotius* saw) had put in the Doxology out of the *Greek* Liturgies, why did they not also put it in in the Gospel of *Luke*? unless it could be made appear that the *Greek* Liturgies varied, I know not how he can answer this question. Let me add this caution to young Scholars, that they be not too hasty to give credit to every Copy that some men magnifie. That *Syriack* Translation which is followed in the New Testament in our *Polyglot* Bibles, if it were the ancientest, would be a good argument of the Antiquity of Festivals or Holy-days; but the Translation which *Immanuel Tremelinus* followed, for ought I know may be much ancients; and in it there appeareth no such distinction of days. To return to *St. Luke*, if his *Alysts* import that we must use his very words in *Greek*, or words in our language as near as may be to his, then must we not follow our Liturgy; for though it sometimes inserts the Doxology, and sometimes omits it, yet it never translateth the Lords Prayer according to *St. Luke*; Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us; is not to translate, but paraphrase on *St. Luke*. It is a little odd, that in the whole Liturgy the Lords Prayer should never be put in the same words that are used in all our Translations of the Bibles that were authorized, whether new or old. Will *Mr. D.* say, If Christ bid us use these very words, that we may use other of like nature



nature and import; and yet that if the Church bid us use her words, that we must use them and no other? The *Brownist* will say the Church may well allow as much liberty as she taketh. Besides, what assurance can Mr. D. give the *Brownists* what words the Lord Jesus used when his disciples desired him to teach them how to pray? *Grotius* the great, saith, *It is credible, that several things are thrown into the Greek copies of St. Luke, out of St. Matthew; and the things he supposeth to be thrust in, are all that are left out of the old Latin copies; if so, the Lords Prayer must be made much shorter than ever it is made in our Liturgy; we must not say which art in heaven; nor thy will be done as in heaven, so on earth; nor, but deliver us from evil.* The *Brownist* hath not yet done with Mr. D. but will ask him how often he is bound to say the Lords Prayer by virtue of the ὁράντες ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγῶναι : p. 27. of his Sermon he tells them, that this and another reason by him there mentioned, obliged those Protestants which follow the Augustane Confession, and those of the Reformed Churches of Holland. to say it ordinarily before and after meals, at the end of their Graces. Had these men reason to think themselves obliged to this custom? If they had, then is Mr. D. obliged also, and sins every time he doth not use the Lords Prayer before and after meals: if it were their mistake to think themselves obliged, how will he give security that he is not mistaken in counting himself obliged to say a *Pater noster* every time that he bends his knee to God in prayer, either in the beginning, or middle, or end of his prayer?

If

If he plead a command of Christ, as he doth in that Sermon, he must prove the *quoties*, which it will be hard for him to do; and if he talk of Christs sanctifying a form with his own mouth, he must give us either the very words Christ spoke, or else a juster translation of them than any he will find in the Common-prayer-book.

Finally, If we have not received the grace of the Gospel in vain, we must look on Christ as risen from the dead, ascended into heaven, confirmed the Universal Priest, Intercessor, and Advocate; so could not the Disciples look on him when Christ taught them to pray; which may be the reason why he told them, *that hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name*, Joh. 16. 24. wherefore though it be lawful and expedient to use the Lords Prayer, as we commonly use it; and though the things to be prayed for, cannot be better summed up, or more briefly comprised; yet vulgar people will be in great danger not to say the Lords Prayer in the Lords name; not to think of his merit and intercession, unless they have prayers so formed as to force them to a more distinct apprehension of Christs propitiation, than the Lords Prayer doth. Let it be observed whether the Doxologies made, or mentioned to be made after Christs ascension into heaven, do not lead us distinctly and particularly to offer and ascribe praise unto God, in the name of Christ, or by Christ; or unto God and the Lamb, or unto Christ, *Ephes. 3. 21. 1 Tim. 6. 16. Rev. 5. 13.* The more pains that Dr. Lightfoot and others do take to show us the Lords Prayer in the Jewish Liturgies, the more do they unawares streng-

strengthen men in a persuasion that it was not intended to be a pattern to us to form our prayers unto, any more than as to the matter, or things to be prayed for. It cannot be that the Jewish and Christian Liturgy should not differ much in the manner of our addresses unto God: it will be hard to find the Holy One called *the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, or *his God and our God, his father and our father*, by any Jew; and yet no expressions more meet for the mouth of a Christian.

I pass to the third calumny in Mr. D.'s p. 144. *Most of them wholly neglected the Lords Supper for many years.* Neglect is when a Minister hath opportunity to administer, and doth not administer; Did most of the *Presbyterians* thus neglect the administration of the Eucharist? Who doth not know that many of them administered it oftner than by the Liturgy is required? Hath Mr. D. never heard of their Associations either printed or not printed, in order to the exercise of discipline? Doth not the Directory say, The Lords Supper is to be administered often? If any secluded any one from that Ordinance who was of an orderly life, and understood the first principles of the Oracles of God, he did it not from *Presbyterian* principles; but I remember that p. 44. he taxeth the Universities of this Kingdom, and saith, *That the University of Oxford had no Communion for above twelve years.* Yet the Ministers are known, who did frequently administer the Communion in the Churches and Chappels of that University, in those  
twelve

twelve years. But it may be he meant, *that in twelve years time the University as an University had no Communion.* To which I say, If that were a fault, it will not much concern the *Presbyterians*; for the four Vicechancellors of Oxford during those twelve years, were not *Presbyterians*; and perhaps the University as an University, is not a Church: for if it be, who is Pastor of it? or who hath power to censure those who be disorderly? Both Chancellor and Vicechancellor may be lay-men. The Communions appointed to be at *St. Maries* at the beginning of the Terms, were lately appointed, and the penalties appointed for those who neglect to come to them, are not Ecclesiastical penalties, and I believe the twentieth part of the University never was at any one of them: was it meet to make such a clamour about the omission of them?

A fourth Calumny is, *That in the Presbyterian Congregations, there was a great irreverence at prayer, very few kneeling, many not so much as pulling off their hats.* Of this irreverence he saith he is an eye-witness. Was he not well employed the mean while? Could he find nothing else to do when in a Christian Congregation, but only to tell how many kneeled, and who had their hats quite off, and who half off, and who never uncovered their head at all? In how many Congregations was he to make this observation? if (as is probable) but in a few, what unrighteousness is it to measure all Congregations by a few? And is he sure that the men whom he observed to be so irreverent, were *Presbyterians*? Why might they not

not b  
to pu  
kneel  
to th  
case  
that  
But i  
like I  
abhor  
Co  
to la  
sembl  
sure  
belie  
confi  
turg  
Chur  
vulga  
not,  
Pray  
see w  
if th  
of t  
obei  
you  
their  
with  
all h  
foun  
Lor  
Pray  
told  
othe

not be some of his own perswasion who did come to put an affront on *Presbyterians* Prayers? Either kneeling, or standing *Presbyterians* commended to their people, and never practised (unless in case of infirmity) any other gesture in praying that ever I heard of, and yet I have made enquiry. But it was necessary that Mr. *D.* should draw them like Devils or else he could not have made them abhorred.

Could a man but obtain leave of his conscience to lay open the irreverence of the Episcopal Assemblies, what stories might he tell? More I am sure than Mr. *D.* would be willing to hear. I believe there is not an honest heart but akes to consider the rudeness of the admirers of our Liturgy in their addresses to God whether in the Church or in their own houses. I speak of the vulgar sort of them; put on their Hats they do not, but they usually sit on their seats, at publick Prayer, and which is worse stare up and down to see who comes in, and who goes out of the Church, if their Landlord chance to come in, in the midst of their Devotion up they rise and make their obeisance. Follow them to their Houses there you may observe them to truss and pray, to wash their Faces and to say their Prayers. I once met with an old man who had been bred up to Liturgies all his days, dealing with him about his Soul, I found he never prayed any thing at home but the Lords-Prayer, and that he never repeated that Prayer till he was first got into his bed, and he told me he thought no man in *England* used any other posture in saying his Prayers. And I was  
told

told by a Minister whom I dare believe, that he hapned at an Inn, to lie in the same Chamber with a man of a good estate, who waking in the morning and thinking the Divine to be asleep, gets out of his bed, takes his Doublet and Breeches, falls to dressing himself, but whilest he dressed himself he said the general confession and the absolution in the Common-Prayer-Book ; when he was beginning the Lords-Prayer, then he took the Chamber-pot into his hand, and did it may be imagined what. Here's irreverence with a witness, I charge it not on Episcopacy, yet I may with a better conscience than Mr. D. chargeth the not putting off of Hats at Prayer on *Presbytery*, or *Presbyterian Nonconformists*. He that would know what outward reverence they require in the worship of God, and upon what reasons they build it, and how necessary they account it, and what thoughts they have of those who use it not, may inform himself from Mr. *Arthur Hildersham* plain but very solid discourse on the fourth of *St. John*. He that hath not the Book by him may find much quoted out of him by Dr. *Nicholas Bernard* in his discourse of a set form of Prayer, Printed, 1659.

And now that I am fallen upon Mr. D's forty fourth page, it may not be amiss to advert that he sears not to say, *all the Reformed world over no man that is not a notorious ill-liver, is debarred from the Sacrament* ; what will he be afraid to say that sears not to say this ? Is there no reformed Church that debars any but a notorious ill-liver from the Sacrament ? Certainly it is not necessary that

that he who danceth should be a notorious ill liver, and yet Mr. D. knows where any that can be proved to have danced, would be kept from the Sacrament. He that should turn *Pelagian* may be no notorious ill-liver, yet such a one would be kept from the Sacrament in most if not in all reformed Churches, so would he also that should not be satisfied to bring his Child to Baptism; and yet I imagine such a one need not be a notorious ill-liver. Suppose an *English* Protestant should think it irreverence to receive the Sacrament not kneeling, such a man if Mr. D. be to be believed cannot be admitted to the Sacrament in *France*, yet such a one may lead a life not notoriously scandalous. By a Canon of our own Church, the communion is to be administered to none but such as kneel, nor to any but such as be present at publick Prayers, according to the orders of the Church, yet I know some such who are far enough from being notorious ill livers. I am almost certain that there is scarce a reformed Church whose Principles and Rules of discipline do not debar such from Sacramental communion as are no notorious ill livers, I wish I were as certain that no Reformed Churches did contrary to their own Rules of discipline, admit such as are notorious ill-livers, then I should promise my self that Christ would with more delight walk among his golden Candlesticks.

P. 185. Whatever be the reason of it, *Our Liturgy hath no other Enemies abroad where it is well known, but the Papists.* This is an untruth as might be proved, by a thousand instances. Put

H

let

let us see the occasion of it, that we have in the same Page. *The Magistrate of Paris his stopping the Printing and forbidding the publishing of the English Liturgy, (whereas that of Geneva is daily Printed and sold there)* the reason he thinks could be no other, but a fear that it would be better liked by most Christians, *that have either judgment, learning or true piety, and are void of superstition, peevishness, extravagant zeal, and prophaneness, be they of what persuasion soever.* This is not very charitable, all or most that are not either superstitious, peevish, extravagantly zealous, and prophane will better like the *English* than the *Geneva* Liturgy. If after this the *French* Ministers do not Petition their King that they may exchange the *Geneva* for the *English* Liturgy, they know their doom.

Perhaps Mr. D. will plead that the *French* living in *France*, would be denied the use of the *English* Liturgy Translated into their own Language though they should desire it. But what will he say to those *French* Churches that are scattered up and down in this Nation, they are not sure quite void of judgment, learning, true piety, yet it is known, that they when they might have had thanks from Archbishop *Laud*, if they would have received the *English* Liturgy for the *French*, which they had been accustomed to, did not care for receiving of it, but used all possible endeavours, to keep themselves in *statu quo*. Dr. *Heylin* relates the History of their wrestlings against the introduction of our Liturgy among them, from him Mr. D. may take it at his leisure. If I have not forgot



forgot since I read it, one argument made use of to keep the Metropolitan from pressing them to Conformity, was drawn from the just fear there was, that by so rigorous calling for Uniformity, the Christian King might be moved to persecute his Protestant Subjects; for Cardinal *Richlieu* had given out such a speech, *If the King of England being a Protestant will not suffer two disciplines, why should the King of France being a Papist suffer two Religions?* A shrewd speech and well to be thought on by any Metropolitan that shall go about to bring all foreign Churches to comply with our own, or else to dissolve them.

I take no notice of the High commendations given of our Liturgy, by the noble Princess of *Turenne*, and the Dutchess of *la Force* her own Mother, he that will may see them *Page 78*, and 186. I only wish that if the *English* Liturgy be of so great force to edifie people in the Protestant Religion, it had been put into the hand of the Noble Marquess of *Turenne* to prevent his revolt to *Popery*, for it is said that he is grown a Roman Catholick.

In his Sermon *P. 20*. He is not ashamed to say "that whosoever hath devotion and leisure enough to come to the Church, and be present at Divine Service every day morning and evening may hear the whole Bible read every Year, the old Testament once, and the new no less than thrice, and the Book of Psalms no less than twelve times.

This can only be practised by those who live near to Cathedrals, let us imagine that any so

living, had devotion, and leisure enough, to come to his mother Church, from the first of *January*, to the last of *December*, this man would not hear the whole Bible, neither the Old Testament once, nor the New Testament thrice. The Liturgy saith so, yet Mr. *D.* in a pang of zeal, dare say otherwise. Whether the Church do well to leave out 188 Chapters of the Old Testament, and to appoint 121 of the *Apocrypha*, is not the question, we are on a matter of fact, and I say Mr. *D.* hath falsified in that, and will have no thanks for his falsification, the Church not desiring him to lie for her sake.

Another tale in *P. 23.* of his Sermon. *It is required of the People that they repeat aloud the confession of Sins, that they may be more sensibly affected therewith.*

This is just like giving a reason why the Swan sings just before her death whenas we know that she doth not so sing. The people are not required to repeat aloud the confession of sins, rather they are exhorted to repeat it with a submiss, or lowly voice. But now we are fallen on this word *Loud*, I would fain know what the meaning of it is. In the first Book of *Edward* the sixth the Priest being in the Quire was appointed to begin the Divine Service with the Lords-Prayer, using a loud voice; in the late Liturgies he is appointed after the Absolution, to begin it with a loud voice; in this last with an audible voice, the people kneeling and repeating it with him; in the *Precatiuncles* after the Creed, the Minister, Clerks, and People are ordered to say the Lords-Prayer with a loud voice;

voice, in former and later Books. But in K. *Edward's* first Book the people were not to speak till *deliver us from evil*; at evening prayer t's appointed that the Minister shall kneel, and say the *Lords-Prayer, the people kneeling, and repeating it with him*, no mention being made of the kind of voice to be used, yet after the Creed at evening prayer, all are to say the Prayer with a loud voice. I never observed any Minister or people to speak louder, in repeating the Lords Prayer at one time than at another, nor know I what is meant by a loud voice, or whether there be any difference betwixt it and an audible voice, nor if there be none, what's meant by an audible voice, for to whom must the peoples voice be audible, to those that sit next to them? or to the Minister? or to the whole congregation? Mr. D. doth converse with great personages, and he knows the meaning of these terms.

' P. 265. In the reign of Queen *Elizabeth* before the making of the Act of Uniformity, those that did not love white, made a great noise within and without this land, and bestirred themselves on all sides that they might be dispensed with for wearing the surplice. Among other means used by them to come to their ends, they applied themselves to some in the reformed Churches beyond the Seas, and perswaded them that if the surplice was imposed, huge numbers of Ministers, nay many of the Bishops themselves, would leave their Ministry. Whereupon the Prince Elector Palatine that then was, commanded *Zanchinus* to write to the Queen, to dissuade her Majesty

‘ from imposing the use of such Vestments, which he  
 ‘ did accordingly ; but the business not succeeding  
 ‘ according to their desires, and the Noncon-  
 ‘ formists giving out still that there would be a  
 ‘ great dissipation in this Church by the desertion  
 ‘ of so many Bishops and Ministers, what did *Zan-*  
 ‘ *chins* thereupon, &c.

Such an Harangue of impertinence and falshood  
 have I seldom or never met with ; and yet we are  
 in the Margin directed to *Zanchy’s* Epistle to  
*Juel*, as if thence all the materials of it had been  
 fetched. In my books *Zanchy’s* Letter to *Juel*  
 bears date just the very day next to that written  
 to *Q. Eliz.* so that in twenty four hours time the  
 Nonconformists of *England* must know that a Let-  
 ter came from *Heidelberg* to *London*, was received  
 by the Queen, and proved not effectual with her,  
 and thereupon give out stories of Bishops that  
 would leave their Sees, and hope for another Ad-  
 dress to be made on their behalf ; if so, they must  
 needs have the Intelligences that move the *Primum*  
*mobile* for their Secretaries and Messengers.  
*Zanchy’s* Letter to *Juel* I am sure doth not in the  
 least intimate, that the *English* Nonconformists  
 made any applications to some in the Reformed  
 Churches beyond the Seas ; all that can thence be  
 collected, is but this, that the *June* before he did  
 write his Letter, one called *Montius* returned out  
 of *England*, and told him besides others, that a great  
 difference was stirred up in the *English* Church a-  
 bout Vestments, and therefore desired him that he  
 would by a Letter both admonish the Queen of her  
 Office, and also write to those Bishops that were  
 known

known to him, and especially to Juel. Upon his and others entreaties, and his Princes command, *Zanchy* did write to the Queen a Letter, as he was confident, not evil, (which is to be seen) and not knowing what the Queen would do, he writes also to *Juel*, That he would by his Authority, Learning and Prudence, endeavour with the Bishops not to leave their Sees, rather than wear linnen; yet so, that they must know that the Queen is inexorable; and also when they wear linnen, make a protestation.

This Letter, 'tis like, never came to *Juel's* hands, he dying about twelve days after it was written. Nor need it trouble us, that *Juel* never saw it, seeing there was no Bishop then in any danger to lose his Place for not wearing linnen; nor can I think there is any one Minister now so much out of love with white, as rather to leave his Ministry, than put on a Surplice, provided he may but make lawful protestation how and on what accounts he useth it. Indeed the *ψηφισμα* of some Nonconformists in the late times was this, that they loved white too well; for their woollen clothes were white, or next to white; their locks were powdered with white powder, their white Half-shirts were very visible, to the great offence of some serious persons both in Countrey and University. But let not Mr. *D.* rejoyce because some Nonconformists did thus habit themselves; for these Nonconformists were not *Presbyterians*, but either inclined to ways of separation, or else such as had newly laid by their Canonical dress, and were resolved no longer to be called black-coats.

Here therefore let me beseech all who would not be deceived in reading our Histories concerning the disorderly carriages of Ministers in the late times, well to consider who they were that were so disorderly; and if they find that any of them were of the old Nonconforming *Presbyterians*; I am much mistaken: if they find none were such, how unreasonable is it to charge on *Presbyterians* the faults of such as returned to Conformity so soon as His Majesty required them; and left not off to conform till they could not keep their Conformity and Livings too?

Too too long I have been in detecting falshoods, had it not been necessary to try whether I could put Mr. D. to some shame. I am now to shew you, as briefly as I can; in how many things he hath wronged his Munificent and Bountiful Mother of *England*.

P. 10. He takes pains to tell us of an Oath of Canonical obedience sworn by Ministers in *Hungary* to the Bishop and to the Seniors: in the Oath he that swears, acknowledgeth himself to receive his Ministry from both Bishop and Seniors. These Seniors are but a more eminent sort of *Presbyters*, as his quotation p. 11. intimates. What is this but to bring in *Hungary's* witness against the sole power of Order and Jurisdiction of the *English* Bishops?

P. 12, 13. He relates a tedious story of the *fratres Bohemi*, and the care that they took to preserve a succession of Ministers. They sent Michael Zamborgius and two more to the poor Waldenses (who never had a Bishop among them but in title only)

and

and two titular Bishops, with some that had not so much as the title of Bishops, made Zambergius and his two Collegues Bishops, giving them power of Ordination. This is manifestly to put a weapon into the *Presbyterians* hands; they were wont only to quote the story of *Pelagius* the Pope being ordained by a *Presbyter* with two Bishops, now Mr. D. hath afforded them another Story, to prove that a *Presbyter* may lay hands on, and ordain Bishops; Is this his kindness to the Prelates?

Another prejudice and mischief he designs to the Church is as he tells us, Page 14. To set forth a Collection of the several Liturgies of all the Protestant Churches. This may please him, because it is the brat of his own brain, but will not surely please the Reverend Fathers of the Church. Doth he not know that Archbishop *Laud* did put a stop to the Letters Patents, for a Collection for the Palatinate, because it was said in them, that the Palatinate Religion, and ours was the same, and that Popery was an Antichristian yoke? Doth he not also know that when a Book was Published here in England intituled a Declaration of the Faith and Ceremonies of the Palsgraves Churches, Archbishop *Laud* took a course to call it in? I advise him, if he love his preferments, no more to meddle in this kind. Had Dr. *Peter du Moulin* any thing bestowed on him since he answered *Philanax Anglicus*?

P. 45. He quotes *Calvin* saying that the custom of distributing the Sacrament but thrice a year is vicious, and yet that is the custom of our Church,  
and

and that not observed in all places neither, for the generality communicate but once a year, and so follow, if Mr. D. be in the right, *the Devils invention.*

P. 53. He saith by just and evident consequence that there is not a wise understanding Christian in our Church, for these are his words: *That every national Church ought to have Uniformity within it self, hath always been the judgment of all sober Christians:* I assume, *That every national Church should have Uniformity within it self, hath not been the judgment of the Church of England.* I tremble for Mr. D's sake to infer the conclusion. The Minor I prove from the Canons of 1640. where a difformity is allowed, and the Apostolical rule commended to dissenters, not to judge, not to despise.

Follow him but to P. 93. and there you shall have him charging Rebellion and Schisme on the major part of his Conforming brethren. For there he tells us *of a great persecution against all Ministers who adhered to the King and Church of England during the late troubles, this persecution was so gentle to some as only to plunder and turn them out of their livings, but cast others out of the Land, or forced them to a voluntary exile.* Thus therefore I argue:

‘All Ministers that adhered to the King and Church, were either turned out of their livings or banished, or left the Land.

‘The major part of the Conforming Ministers did neither lose their livings, nor were banished, nor went into voluntary exile.

‘There-



‘ Therefore the major part of the Conforming  
 ‘ Ministers neither adhered to King, nor Church;  
 ‘ and by just consequence were Traitors and Schif-  
 ‘ maticks. The Minor is as clear as the Sun, to  
 all that observed the management of things in  
*England*, he that Licensed Mr. D’s Book had *the*  
*same Fellowship in All Soules*, at his Majesties re-  
 turn, that he had at the decollation of his Fa-  
 ther.

P. 95. He tells us, that he and some others were  
 admitted to livings in France, the Synod desiring  
 them only to conform to their Rites, Ceremonies,  
 and Orders, for the time they should live amongst  
 them, (for a Nonconformist Minister is a thing un-  
 known and never suffered in those Churches.) This  
 is nonsense to an English ear, for the Church may  
 be full of Nonconformists if men are admitted into  
 livings, being desired only and not enjoined to  
 conform to Rites and Ceremonies and Orders.  
 But he told us P. 34. *All admitted to livings must*  
*subscribe to the confession of faith*, wherefore we  
 may think he subscribed to the parity of Ministers,  
 and by an order passed at Charenton all are to  
 swear they will propugne the Canons of the Synod  
 of *Dort*, if that order be not rescinded, then ’tis  
 like he is under Oath to defend a Doctrine which  
 most of the Fathers of this Church think, if not  
 against our own Doctrine, yet subversive of the  
 Doctrine according to Godliness.

P. 96. He saith that it is a principle common  
 to all reformed Churches in the World, *That*  
*every national Church hath power to make Laws for*  
*her self, in all such outward things as are not either*  
*expressly*

*expresly commanded, or forbidden in the word of God.*

God forbid that any such principle should be maintained, by all or by any Reformed Church in the whole world. There are many outward as well as inward things not commanded nor forbidden *expresly*, but only by just and necessary consequence, about which the Church hath no power to make Laws to her self any more than about those things that are *expresly* either commanded or forbidden, else there would be mad work in the World. Where doth Mr. D. find family Prayer, or infant Baptisme, or the observation of the Lords days *expresly* either forbidden or commanded in Gods word? He will say that the Church may make Laws about these, I grant she may, but no other than what she can make about things either commanded or forbidden *expresly*. So that he wrongeth not only our own Church, but all Reformed Churches in affixing such a principle to them. Dr. Heylin ascribes to Calvin a quite contrary principle. *Hist. of Presb.* 238.

‘ That in carrying on the work of a Reformation,  
 ‘ there is not any thing to be exacted, which is not  
 ‘ warranted, and required by the word of God;  
 ‘ that in such cases there is no Rule left for worldly  
 ‘ wisdom, for moderation and compliance, but all  
 ‘ things to be ordered, as they are directed by his  
 ‘ will revealed.

Page 241. He makes this *Calvins* rule, and *Martyrs* judgment to be grounded on it, *That nothing should be acted in a Reformation, which is not warranted expresly in the word of God.* Are  
 East

East and West more opposite than Dr. H. and Mr. D. yet neither truly represents the opinion of the Reformed. I beseech those who are at leisure, and have well studied the point, to state plainly and clearly unto us the due matter of Ecclesiastical Laws, and to show us the meaning of the term, indifferent, so frequently made use of in this Controversy: for it seemeth somewhat an uncouth assertion that Church governors may command all things that are usually called indifferent, for then many of their Laws would be very contemptible. The old definition of things *Adiaphorou* was, that they were things neither commanded, nor forbidden; this definition seemed to me innocent enough, but of late there are Divines sprung up, that say, the highest acts of love to God are not commanded, neither I trow are they forbidden, must we call them then things indifferent? And hath the Church power to determine who shall put forth those Acts, and how often they shall be put forth? It may be Mr. D. thinks the highest acts of love are commanded, (and so do I) but he had best not to be too forward in publishing that notion.

P. 99. He falls into an high commendation of the *Bohemian* Churches, as he doth also in many other Pages of his Book; this is little to the advantage of our Church; for if that Church be to be imitated, we must have lay *Presbyters* and lay *Presbyteresses* also, Pastors of Parishes must confirm, people must come under examination every time they receive the Sacrament, we must have no dancings, and we may have particular Synods  
wish-

without a Bishop, if we communicate the acts thereof presently to the absent Bishops, and we must have none brought into Communion but those who are willing, and yet we here can by censures, if we please, make Papiſts communicate with us, or else have them excommunicated and clapt into Prison.

P. 107. He gives the *Presbyterians* lame Cause a crutch. For he saith, *God only hath power to bind the Conscience immediately*; ask him when mens Consciences are bound immediately, he tells you, *when humane Laws and Constitutions are thrust upon men, as if they were Divine.*

Here will the *Presbyterian* say, Episcopacy which is but an humane institution, is thrust on us as Divine, and not only as good and profitable; therefore unless we will give men jurisdiction over our consciences, we cannot conform. Mr. D. cannot bring himself off here, but by maintaining that Episcopacy is a Divine institution, and it would be too great impudence to say that in so saying he should not contradict every reformed Church almost besides our own.

P. 118. He mentions the sending of a Printed Copy of the Acts of the Synod of *Dort* to King *James*, Prince *Charles*, Archbishop of *Canterbury* by *Festus Hommius*, this is to rub a sore place, and to tell the World, that we who now suffer our Divines and Students to bespatter that Synod, did once well approve of its decisions.

P. 126. He mentions a Letter of Monsieur le *Moine*, out of which he saith he will set down as much as his present design: what doth he set down?  
as follows

down? Why Page 136. That the *English* have a natural fierceness, and withal a natural inclination to superstition. Is this for Mr. *Darells* design, to blast the people of that nation where he hath been so highly preferred? Are we indeed fierce and superstitious? Naturally fierce, and naturally Superstitious? What kind of superstition is it to which we are so naturally inclined, that so we may know how to enquire after the cure of so dangerous a disease? It is no matter if we may believe Mr. *Moine* to enquire further, let but Episcopal Authority be established, that will keep us from going beyond our bounds. Very good, but by whom shall this Episcopal Authority be managed? By *English* men I hope, but how then can we be assured that their natural fierceness and inclination to superstition will not remain in them? We never could observe that a mans being constituted a Bishop did make him less fierce or superstitious, any more than less an *English* man. Perhaps this Learned Predicant would have all our Divines come and study in *France*, that they may lose their disease of superstition, as sometimes they do their Consumptions in so refined an Air, but that Plot will not take. He hath another argument for Episcopacy, it cannot enter into a rational mans imagination, that a great Kingdom should come by custom to be content to see its Bishops no more, having honoured and revered them for the space of 1400 Years. If this be so, then may the Bishops be secure, we are so accustomed to love them, that we cannot be content to be without them, and have been a great Kingdom and honoured and

reve-

reverenced them 1400 Years. Where may we that live in *England* find these things recorded concerning our selves? for the Histories we read usually, do not make us a great Kingdom, but many petty Kingdoms 1400 Years ago.

‘ If ever any made their ungratefulness notorious, certainly they are the *English* opposers of Episcopacy, who will not consider that they owe their Reformation to the care and zeal of their Bishops, who did so wonderfully well re-purge the Church of *England* an hundred years ago, and so happily set up the holy truth again, in its genuine lustre. But this is not all they owe unto them: they owe them also their Christianity. For whether it was brought over into *England* by *Joseph of Arimathea*, or by *Simon Canan*, or by *St. Paul*, or by *St. Peter*, or by *Luke* disciple of *Philip*, or by *Phaganus* and *Perusianus*, in the time of King *Lucius*, it is constant that it was done by the Ministry of Bishops, and that they are endebted to their charity, zeal, and abilities, for the holy Reformation they now enjoy.

Do we indeed owe our late Reformation from Popery unto Bishops? *Wickliff* the day-star of our reformation, was no Bishop; those that suffered in King *Henry* the eighths time were no Bishops: *Cranmer* when he first set himself to dispute against the Marriage was no Bishop, when under that King he obtained to be a Bishop he had his hand in the blood of the Saints. Yet we honour his memory, for what he did towards Reformation in King *Edward* the sixth’s time; and for what he had begun

begun to do in his fathers reign, we can easily forgive him his Petitioning the King for liberty for his sister *Mary*, and his fierce opposition to Mr. *Hooper*; but we should be against the truth, if we do not say, that our Reformation had been very imperfect, if not strenuously promoted by the *Presbyters* and *Nonconformists* of that age. We must need say, that *Cranmer* did recant, and that Bishop *Ridley* had begun in the Tower to go to Mass, and left not off, till reclaimed by the Letter of his Nonconforming friend and Pupil Mr. *John Bradford*. Those that least loved ceremonies did least love their lives when they were to lose them for Christs sake. I take no pleasure in this comparison, nor had I made it, but that Mr. *D.* ascribes a strange weakness to Mr. *Hooper*, and makes Peter Martyr to scruple a Cap because it was too Mathematical. As for our first conversion from Paganisme, Mr. *Moine* writes very strangely about it.

P. 40. Else he would not saint *Peter* and *Paul*, and not *Joseph* of *Arimathea*, nor *Philip*, nor *Simon Cannaus*. Nor secondly would he have left out *Aristobulus* whom some have affirmed to Preach the Gospel among us, and to be Bishop of *Britan*, and to have ended his days in *Britan*, and instead of him put in *Luke* a disciple of *Philip*: for what considerable Author ever ascribed the first bringing of Christianity among us unto *Luke* a disciple of *Philip*? We have indeed a story that St. *Philip*, (but whether the Apostle or Evangelist none can tell) sent over twelve Preachers into *Britan* perhaps Mr. *Moine* hath met with some Autho,  
I who

who tells him that one of their names was *Luke*, but the chief of them being *Joseph of Arimathea*, as all agree, unto him we must ascribe the work under God.

But he will scarce be proved to be a Bishop, or to have left any Bishop behind him. It may be in the reign of King *Lucius* we shall meet with Bishops. The story of him runs thus; That about the year 160 he began to have a good liking of Christianity, being convinced by the Miracles he saw or heard to be wrought by the Christians of that age. He had with him, *Elvanus*, and *Medvinus* two holy men, and well versed in the Scripture whom he sends to *Eleutherius* (or as some would have his name written *Eleutherus*) Bishop of *Rome*, desiring that by him he might be made a Christian, that is Christened or Baptized, for he is conceived to have believed with the heart before. Why did he send so far to procure Baptisme? had he no Ministers in that *Island* over a part of which he was an under King? Perhaps he had, but thought it more Royal to send to *Rome* for Ministers; from *Rome* he had two sent him, the Roman Martyrology calls them *Fugatius*, and *Donatianus*, alias *Damianus*, others write them *Faganus* and *Derwianus* or *Dunianus*, others *Phaganus* and *Duvianus*, (none I think *Phaganus* and *Perusianus* but M. M. and D.) That either of these was a Bishop there is no evidence, *Mason* saith plainly, neither of them did ever attain that dignity. *Elvanus* some say was made a Bishop, and *Medvinus* a Doctor or Presbyter. Hitherto we have but a Bishop, no Bishops, to whose zeal we



we are indebted for our Christianity. And I am of opinion that as *Elvanus* was as much a Doctor as *Medvinus*, so *Medvinus* was as much a Bishop as *Elvanus*, and that there never was Bishop properly so called among us till *Austin* the Monk was sent hither from *Rome*. The stories of 28 Bishops made in the room of 28 *Flamens*, and 3 Archbishops made in the place of 3 *Archflamens*, seems to me as well as to Mr. *Fuller*, *Flammes*, and *Archflammes*. I know that at the Council of *Ariminum*, *Sulpitius* makes three Bishops out of *Britan*, to be present, *Anno* 259. As also that *Athanasius* speaks of *British* Bishops at the Council of *Sardis*, *Anno* 347. Nor will I deny that *Restitutus* Bishop of *London* is reported to have subscribed to the Council of *Arles* in *France*, *Anno* 314: but if he and others subscribed to the determinations of that Synod, how comes it to pass that the Churches to which they belonged did not account themselves concerned to leave off their old, and almost singular way of observing Easter? surely it must be because Bishops were not then thought to have so much authority over their Churches as now they would be thought to have. When *Austin* the Monk had got entertainment in the Kingdom of the *Mercians*, and was made Archbishop of *Canterbury*, he calls a Council to be made up of *British*, and *Saxons*, and now if ever, we shall find what the Government Ecclesiastical of the *British* was, and pity it is we must fetch our account of it, only, or principally, from *Bede*, a venerable man indeed, but a Saxon, and professed enemy to the *British*.

Two Meetings *Austin* and the *British* had: To the first came certain Bishops, saith *Bede*, lib.2. c.2. but let his phrase be observed, *Episcopi, sine Doctores* being come, *Austin* layeth to their charge, That they practised many things contrary to the unity of the Church. But they continuing to prefer their own rites to those that *Austin* would have commended to them, the crafty Archbishop perswades them to refer the decision to God himself, but so that the *British* who were in possession, must first try whether God would work a miracle in favour of their opinion; not being able to cure a blind man brought before them. *Austin* falls on his knees, praying the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that by restoring sight to that one blind man, he would enlighten the eyes of many; and forthwith the blind was enabled to see. What was the effect? the *British* ought to have condemned themselves for consenting to tempt God; but if we may believe *Bede*, they acknowledge that *Austin* declared the way of righteousness (as if the way of righteousness had consisted in rites and ceremonies); but that they could not without the consent and leave of theirs, depart from their old customs. It seems these Bishops did not think that their consent could conclude their Presbyters and people. Well, another meeting is agreed on, to which came no fewer than seven Bishops and many very learned men, especially out of the famous Monastery now called *Bangor*, but anciently *Bancornaburgh*; these, before they came to the place appointed, ask counsel of a wise and pious *Anchoret*, whether they had best desert their Traditions upon the

the preaching of *Austin*: *If he be a man of God,* quoth this Counceller, *then follow him ; and if when you come into the room, he rise up to you, then take him to be a servant of Christ.* *Austin* not rising up to them when they came into the place of conference, they contradict him in every thing he propounded. In three things at last, saith *Austin*, if you will comply, I will bear with all other your diversities ; 1. You must celebrate *Easter* as we do. 2. You must administer Baptism according to the manner of the holy *Roman Church*. 3. You must preach with us the Gospel to the *English Nation*. Of the many other things in which the *Britans* differed from the *Romish*, I conceive this was one, that they left both *Ordination and Excommunication* to a *Presbyter* as well as to a *Bishop*. And this *Austin* would have tolerated. The reasons of this my opinion are many, and probable, grounded on the Histories of those times ; one I shall mention, *viz.* that the *Scots* were mingled with the *British* when they had these meetings ; now that the *Scots* did originally commit acts of order and jurisdiction to *Presbyters*, is a thing well known ; if any doubt concerning it, he may receive satisfaction from the large Preface of *Mr. Selden* to the Histories published by *Mr. Bee* not twenty years ago. I am the more confident in this my opinion, because I find that when our *British Churches* had thoroughly imbibed the *Romish* modes and customs, then at a Synod held at *Celichyth A. D. 816.* it was decreed, *That none of the Scottish Nation should be permitted to use the sacred Ministry among us.*

This was all I had intended about our old *British Churches*,

Churches when loe there came to my hands the History of Mr. *Petry* quoted by the Latin Apologist; that Historian goeth a little more confidently to work, than I have done; for thus saith he, *Century 11. Pag. 282, 283.*

‘As for *England* since the *Saxons*, or *Englisses* receiving the faith by *Augustine*, they had always Bishops; for they had their Pattern from *Rome* as it was then: but if we look up to the Ancient Britans in that Land, we shall find it otherways. I have said in *Century 7. Chap. 4.* that seven Bishops and one Archbishop, came from the Britans unto *Augustin*: and there I followed the words of Bishop *Juel*, in the defence of the Apology, *Page 14. An. 1520.* where he quoteth *Bede, His. lib. 2. cap. 2.* and in the same Page he quoteth *Galsfred, lib. 8. cap. 8.* repeating the same words. What I wrote then upon trust, I have afterwards examined: and I find that *Bede* speaks not so: for in the Edition in *Fol. Camb. An. 1643.* he saith, *Austin* called the Bishops or Doctors of the nearest Province of the Britans; and in the same Page, he, speaking of the same persons, saith, a blind *Engliss* Boy was brought unto the Priests of the Britans, and again they said they would not depart from the Ancient Customs, without the consent and licence, *suorum.* In the Margin it is said, in the *Saxon* Language it is said, without the permission, and licence of their Nation. Then speaking of their second conference, he saith, then came seven Bishops as they said, and more very Learned men, especially of that Famous *Monastery*, of which the

‘Gover-

' Governour at that time was *Dinnoth*. In a word,  
 ' *Beda* hath not one word of an Archbishop; nor  
 ' in all his History nameth he one Bishops-See, nor  
 ' any Bishops name: and whom he calleth Bishops  
 ' of *Britan*, he calleth them Doctors, or Teachers,  
 ' and Priests, yea he calleth them oftner Priests;  
 ' nor calleth he them simply Bishops, as he calleth  
 ' them simply Priests, but Bishops, as they say,  
 ' or Bishops, or Teachers. Yet *Beda* could distin-  
 ' guish between a Bishop and a Priest—What  
 ' can be concluded from hence, but that no Bishop  
 ' or Prelate was among the *Britans* other than  
 ' Priests? As for *Galsfrid*, it is no marvail that he  
 ' wrote according to the stile of his own time,  
 ' that is the year 1150. The said Author also  
 ' quotes *Gildas* a *Britan* *Presbyter* distinguishing  
 ' Church-men into Bishops or Priests, and the  
 ' Clerks, but naming no other degree of Church-  
 ' men, calling the first sort ofttest *Sacerdotes* simply,  
 ' but never *Episcopos*, unless he adds *five Sacer-*  
 ' *dotes*.

What think I of all this? truly whatever I  
 think, I will not say very much, for I have not  
 by me either *Juels* Apology, or the *Cambridg*  
 Edition of *Beda*, or *Galsfrid*, or *Gildas*. Only  
 thus much I may say, that if *Gildas* who lived  
 before *Austin* was sent to us, and *Bede* who was  
 born as *Thomas Stubbes* computes but *Anno* 677.  
 can give us no tidings of any Church Officers  
 above *Presbyters* among the *Britans*, it will not  
 signifie much that *Jeffry Monmouth* who lived but  
 in King *Stephens* time makes mention of Bishops.  
 To put an end to this matter.

1. He who first converted this *Island* to Christianity was no Bishop.

2. Those two whom *Eleutherius* sent (upon the Petition of *Lucius*) to instruct us, were no Bishops.

3. *Austin* himself and his associates when they first attempted the conversion of the *Mercian Saxons* were no Bishops but only Monks.

4. *Wickliffe* and his followers were no Bishops, but being Presbyters were wont to ordain Presbyters.

5. No one Bishop ever suffered death in *England* for striving against *Popery* till *Queen Maries* Reign.

6. Of those Bishops who suffered in *Queen Maries* Reign the *Nonconformists* may lay claim to as many at least as the *Conformists* can do, and perhaps there was not one *Martyr* in all her Reign that asserted the *Jus divinum* of Episcopacy. Now if all these things be true, what means the clamor of ingratitude against *Presbyterians*, for not owning those to whom they owe the Nations Reformation from *Popery* yea and its Christianity also? But let us view more of *Mr. Moines* Letter. Pag. 139. If the French had kept Bishops, and as many Ceremonies as would serve to fix the attention of the people without superstition, they should have seen for certain, far greater progress of Reformation, and the resistance of a great many persons overcome who are frightened from their communion by the irregularity of their government and the bareness of their service. If this were certain I could wish that they had Bishops and Ceremonies among them

to morrow, but we in *England* have not been able to observe that the number of Papists is lessened since the restitution of Bishops and Ceremonies, nay since that some among us have fallen off to Popery who before professed the Reformed Religion. It is not any form of Government, or external mode of worship, that must put the Papists to shame, but the exemplary lives of Ministers and people who separate from them. When men once feel in their hearts the power of Godliness, they are in no great danger to turn Roman Catholics. He hath another conceit, *P. 139, 140. that the not receiving of Episcopal Government, may hinder the much desired union with the brethren that do follow the confession of Auspurg.* In this I do vehemently dissent from him, for the yielding to Episcopal government would rather alienate them from us. Tell them that the ordinations made by *Luther* are invalid because he was but a mere Presbyter, or that as many of them as come over hither, must be reordained before they are capable of any Ecclesiastical preferment, unless they have been ordained by Bishops properly so called, they will quickly let you see that no reconciliation is to be hoped for. I dare boldly say the generality of *Presbyterians* in *England* are against no Episcopacy but what the *Lutherans* themselves abhor.

There are sundry other things in *Mr. Moines* Letter for the which I could expose him, but I forbear, and desire *English* men not to estimate him by this Letter, which is so interpolated that he need not own it as his. I undertake at any time to bring a credible witness, that shall swear, *that*  
Mr.

Mr. Moins hath both by word of mouth, and also by Letter under his hand declared that his mind about Episcopacy is not truly represented by this Letter, as Printed by Mr. Durel, many things being left out that would as much have crossed his design, as those which he hath published, do further it.

I come now to the Assembly that Mr. Durel hath called to decide our controversies for us, he will have *Joannes Amos Comenius* the only surviving *Bohemian* Bishop permitted to speak first, and the *Presbyterians* desire nothing more, they have some of them translated a great deal of his Book into *English*, they refuse not to stand or fall by his *Paraphesis* directed by name to the Church of *England*, when it seemed solicitous concerning the best form of Church Government. Had not Mr. D. picked and culled out of the writings of the Divines whom he quotes just so much as would serve his turn, he had manifestly betrayed the cause of those who have preferred him, in the judgment of uninterested men; he hath done it consequentially by referring Scholars to the Books of the Authors themselves. For let a man go to the Letter of Monsieur *Bochart* written to Dr. *Morley*, and there he shall find that Presbytery is Ancienter than Episcopacy. The Reader also is directed to go to a Letter of Monsieur *Vauquelin* to prove that he thought the Book of common-prayer very far from Popery and Superstition, Page 278. but if he go to Page 189. he shall find he saith only that there is not in the Book any formal superstition, which certainly is not to say it is very far from superstition.

I pro-



I profess I know not any one Member of that Assembly Mr. D. would have called, that hath not in his writings said more against the Church of England in the Controversies now on foot than for it. Of *Danaus* I have spoken before, and suppose Mr. D. will be willing enough to have him left out of the Synod; if he will not, let him at his leisure read what he saith of *Aerius* in his Comment upon St. *Augustine de Hæresibus*. I shall enquire into the mind only of two or three more, and they shall be such as I suppose he will have no quarrel against, because they are Frenchmen, viz. *Capell, Rivet, Casaubon*: *Capell* tells him his mind plainly, in his *Theses de divini verbi necessitate*, Parag. 29. he saith, that there were by the Apostles themselves instituted Churches, and in every one of them before their death, there was constituted by them a Colledge of Presbyters, by whose Labor, Ministry, and dayly Preaching, the Doctrine of the Gospel might be propagated to the end of the World. In his *Theses* about the vocation of Evangelical Ministers, Parag. 11. The ordinary power of Preaching the Gospel is that which by the Apostles is committed to their successors, Presbyters being by them appointed in every City, in the Churches founded by them. In his *Theses de diversis Ministrorum Evang. Ordinibus & gradibus*, He vehemently contends that the Ministry was properly instituted by God to procure the eternal Salvation of men, and that the order of Presbyters alone may suffice to that end, and that the dignity and superiority of Bishops above Presbyters is meerly of humane constitution, and that there was no cause why

why the Bishops and their Patrons should so much on this cause and account, insult and wax insolent against those whom invidiously they call Puritans, and Presbyterians. In his Theses of the various Regiment of the Church, *Parag. 15.* He severely censures the pompous mode of worship used in our Cathedrals, but *Parag. 24.* he saith plainly, that the English-men did not do unwisely who threw the yoke of Episcopacy off their necks.

Ay, but in his Theses about Liturgies he retracts what he had written about abolishing Hierarchical Government. *Ans.* No man can see such retraction but Mr. D. himself, who sees by extramission and not by intramission, as we may observe, *Page 193, 194.* Had *Capell* intended any retraction he would have used plain words importing a revocation, or retraction of what he had before written, but he useth no words but what may well consist with what he had before said. When the same *Capell* comes to deliver his judgment about festivals, he even laughs at the reason or argument used by our great *Hooker*, to prove them by. But go we from *Capell* to Dr. *Andrew River*, whose engagements and obligations to our Bishops were perhaps greater, for that he was civilly treated by some of them, as he doth somewhere acknowledge; as also that at *Oxford* he had the Honorary degree of Doctor conferred on him. His judgment about Episcopacy we have seen before; about other things let him now have leave to speak. First, it is like enough that at the University he might observe that form of Oath, *Ita me Deus adjuvet, & sancta Dei Evangelia,*

gelia, whether that Oath stuck in his stomach or no, I cannot tell, but in his explication of the Decalogue, he puts this question, 'What is to be thought of that custom which obtaineth in some Churches that have in other things thrown off the Popish superstitions, that he that sweareth should touch the Holy Bibles, or the Gospels, or some part thereof. And answereth, if the words be conceived as among the Papists, so God help me and these Holy Gospels, I see not how the reliques of superstition can be excused. In the same explication of the Decalogue putting the question concerning the Saints days observed here in *England*, he saith 'he cannot approve the judgment of those who accuse our Church of Idolatry on that account, but wisheth withal the custom were amended, because of the peril of Idolatry. Just as our *Presbyterians* are accustomed to say. In his Comment on *Exod. cap. 28*. He handleth a question about the special and peculiar vestments of Ministers, and hath these words. *Whereas in England Ministers put on linen vestments, it were not to be indured, if they did this in imitation of the Jews, or for any mystical signification. But how if they do it only for some distinction, yet still we must be afraid of Gideons Ephod.*

Of the novelty of Organical Musick, he speaks expressly and largely, especially in his Preface to his comment on *Hosea*, and in his *Catholicus Orthodoxus* against *Baily*. Where also he may be seen decrying the observation of Lent if it pretend to be Apostolical. He is indeed a most professed Champion of the Presbyterian cause in almost every thing under debate. As

As for *Isaac Casaubon* he was indeed a very Learned Critick, and for ought I know a person truly pious. Mr. D. accounts him his own, and therefore in the very title Page of his *Vindicia* brings in his testimony to the Church of England, out of an Epistle written to *Claudius Salmasius*, *Quod si me conjectura non fallit, totius Reformatoinis pars integerrima est in Anglia, ubi cum studio veritatis viget studium antiquitatis.*

These words are indeed found in an Epistle written *raptim* hastily, by *Casaubon* to *Salmasius* much about that time when some of our Bishops had declared their approbation of some of *Casaubon's* Theological Essays, which sundry Divines both from *Holland* and *France* had disliked. In this good mood *Casaubon* commends the *English* for the study of Antiquity, but at other times he grievously complains to *Thuanus* and *Heinsius* that we encourage no study but Theology. In the 604 Epist. he asks what good could come of instructing his two sons in learning. *Medicina hic sane non viget. Jurisprudentia illa vetus & vera plane jacet, vix de nomine paucis nota.* Epistle 799. he intimates his design to send his son *Merick* to *Heinsius*, because he desired to have him well exercised in *Greek, Latin, Hebrew*, and could not hope that should be done in *England*. Is not the study of Antiquity like to be carried on well where a young man cannot be trained up to any eminent skill in *Hebrew, Greek* or *Latin*?

I suppose we had not in this last Epistle been so extremely undervalued, had not the learned man been exasperated by Mr. *Mountague*, whose endeavours

vout  
to h  
Epi  
to l  
thou  
that  
aptic  
zealo  
B  
and c  
giving  
the c  
have  
it m  
Chur  
indee  
But  
know  
not  
Chur  
whic  
Chur  
Tem  
Apo  
lest  
Kiss  
Apo  
carel  
our l  
P  
conf  
he sa  
pleas

vours, against *Baronius*, he judged very injurious to his own credit and reputation, as may be seen *Epistle* 717, 718. This may suffice to make us not to be proud of *Casaubons* commendation; if I thought it not sufficient, I could go near to prove, that *Casaubon* judged men more or less studious of antiquity, according as they were more or less zealous against the *Arminians*.

But I let pass his synodical determinations, and come to his Sermon where I find him, *Pag.* 16. giving leave to *Rome* to rank our Reformers among the Contentious, if it can be found that either they have laid aside, or taken up any one thing whereof it may be said that the Holy Apostles, or Apostolick Churches had or had not such a Custom: he addes indeed, *Rome* was never able to do it, nor never shall. But she knows well enough that she can, for she knows, that we have taken up Surplices which were not used by the Holy Apostles or any Apostolick Churches, and we give Baronies to our Bishops which neither the Apostles nor any Apostolick Churches did, and we place our Baptisteries in our Temples, which was done neither by Apostles nor Apostolical Churches. On the other side we have left off Unction, and Love-feasts, and the Holy Kiss, all which were used by the Apostles, and Apostolical Churches. So that *Rome* by Mr. D's carelessly worded proposition hath leave to reckon our Reformers among contentious ones.

P. 17. He useth a plain *Turkish* Argument to confirm and uphold the cause of the Church, for he saith, that the miraculous manner whereby it hath pleased God to raise her up ought to be to all an evident  
proof

proof that she is her beloveds, and her beloved is hers, and an argument that her Reformation is certainly the work of God, and his Counsel which shall stand. Just thus the Papists were wont to prate when Popery was restored by Q. Mary, and just thus also did the Fanaticks argue when they were permitted by God to conquer three flourishing Kingdoms, and to put all the Nations round about into a pannick fear. Let us not be high minded, but rejoyce in trembling. God hath pleaded with us by his strange judgments since Episcopacy was re-established among us, we have had a sharp war, a dreadful fire, a sweeping Pestilence; I do not say because Episcopacy is restored, but because sin doth abound, and prophaneſs runs like a river and mighty flowing stream; if we do not soundly humble our selves, God may soon take from us, his worship, our Ministers, and all that Reformation in the which we glory, and yet his Counsel will stand nevertheless.

Page. 22. He perfectly affronteth the express words of our Church in the Liturgy, for there it is said, that the commination of sinners is used until the Primitive discipline of putting persons convicted of notorious sins to penance at the beginning of Lent, and only until that discipline can be restored which is much to be wished. But Mr. D. saith, there can be nothing more powerful to touch sinners to the quick, and to draw them from their evil courses, than the Commination to which the whole Congregation is bound to say Amen, after every particular denunciation of Gods curse, upon all sorts of sinners who persist in their sins. And indeed it is meet he should

say

say so, for he had before given *Rome* leave to call us Contentious, if we had left off any custom used in the Apostolick Churches, and we here do confess, that we have left off one that was very godly; indeed we say, it is to be wished it were restored, but who hinders the restoring of it but our selves? Have other Churches power to enjoin Penance, and have we none? Or will other people submit to that discipline and not ours? Are not fornicators put to open penance, and why may not other sinners be so punished too? But not to multiply interrogatories, the Church holds penance would be more powerful than the form of commination she useth; Mr. *D.* saith, nothing can be more powerful than the commination; he will sure impose some penance on himself for this boldness, and watch his Pen better for the time to come. Perhaps he will say his meaning was honest, and wholesome, *viz.* that the form of Commination is very powerful to touch sinners to the quick, if so, he may do well to consider, 1. Whether it be conducive to tye Ministers never to use it but on *Ashwednesdays* unless they have particular order from their Ordinaries, for why should so powerful a preservative against sin be used but once a year, especially seeing the use of it but once a year is found insufficient to reclaim profaneness *cum primis salutaris est caeremonia, sed non video cur debeat exhiberi solum uno die, & non saepius*, said the Great *Bucer* when he saw it restrained by the first Book of *K. Edward* to one day, thereupon it was altered in following Liturgies to *divers times in the year*. *Grindals* Articles enjoyed it to be used on some Sunday near the three great feasts of the Church,

K

*Easter,*

*Easter, Pentecost, Christmas, Ashwednesday* not excluded, but now no day is allowed but *Ashwednesday*, unless there come an order from the Ordinary, which I have not heard that any Ordinary hath sent since the return of his Majesty. 2. What meaneth that mincing of the commination, *Deut. 27. 16.* the Text saith, *Cursed is he that setteth light by Father and Mother*, we say: Cursed is he that curseth Father and Mother, what if any should from this take occasion to think that there is no great danger in setting light by Father and Mother, provided they do not rise so high in their impiety as to curse them, (an inquiry that I hope few are guilty of) and what meaneth that addition to the curse of the man that maketh any carved or molten image, *viz.* to worship it. In the Text there is no such addition, and the Church did afterwards in the last commination curse the worshippers of images though now it be changed into Idolaters. The very making of some images, *viz.* of God, the Trinity, &c. doth entitle to a curse whether they be worshipped or no, and what hurt were it if people were made to know so much. 3. Why have we no curse against prophane swearing so common among us, nor any against Rebellion? The Scripture affordeth plenty of such curses.

But as the Comminations is now ordered, I can say Amen to it, taking Amen not only as it signifieth, *so it is*, but as it usually signifieth *so be it*, so run the words in the Bible, *Deut. 27.* so also, *Jer. 17. 5.* And he is unworthy to be continued a Church member, who is like to curse himself by any



any such imprecation, nor shall any man that so prayeth sin against another that is guilty of those sins, for when we say Cursed is such a sinner, our meaning is if he continue, and whilst he continueth such, and with that restriction we may say cursed be, as I doubt not but the *Israelites* did as often as they used this ceremony appointed by God, so thought the *Septuagint*; else they would not have Translated *γινωσκει*.

The Lords-prayer few scruple to say, yet he that useth that form doth virtually curse himself if he have any malice reigning in his heart.

P. 23. He saith we are appointed to be confirmed, to receive the blessing from our Pastor (as if none were our Pastor but a Bishop) *and he gives it with the Imposition of hands, and with prayers, without Chrisme, or any such superstitious or superfluous Ceremony.* What words are these? they do indeed directly only reflect on the ancient Church and our first Reformers, and the compilers of the first Liturgy of *Edward* the sixth, by which chrism was appointed at Baptism, though not that I find in Confirmation, by the *Ancients* I am sure it was used in Confirmation; Mr. D. dare adventure to call it superstitious and superfluous. But his words will by just consequence reach the cross in Baptism, used also in confirmation by the first Reformers, for why should chrisme be accounted a superstitious and superfluous Ceremony, rather than the cross, the one is as Ancient as the other, and as innocent as the other; both were equally abused in Popery, of the two the Cross may seem more superfluous, for in Baptism, we

have an outward rite signifying the same thing that the Cross is pretended to signifie; but to signifie our unction by the Holy Ghost, which was in the first Liturgy prayed for, and ought still to be prayed for, we have no outward rite at all; Nor do I see why unction may not as well be used to certifie confirmed persons of the unction from the Holy one, as imposition of hands, to certifie them of Gods gracious favour and goodness towards them, which is made the end, in the Office of Confirmation.

P. 26. *If the several repetitions of the Lords-prayer, which are to be found in our Liturgy, were made immediately one after another, or within a short time, &c. I say upon such an account we might justly be censured for using vain repetitions.* This wounds the Liturgy sorely if it do not strike it to the very heart, for not to say that it doth appoint several Lords-prayers to be said within a short space, (which may truly be said) it manifestly appoints repetitions of *gloria Patri* within a short space, and this will bring us within the guilt of vain repetitions, unless a reason can be given why *gloria Patri* may be repeated within a short space, and *Pater noster* may not, which reason Mr. D. will give *ad Gracas Calendas*.

Thus have I given you an account of Mr. D's *English Book* under four heads, and now you will expect to have my judgment as touching his Latin Book called *vindicie sacra Ecclesia Anglicana*. I say first that I know not what he means by his *Ecclesia Anglicana*, doth he mean the company of true believers or good Christians (really or re-

putatively

putatively so) in *England*? if he do, *quis Lacedemoniorum vituperat*? why doth he make a vindication of that Church which none went about to accuse? doth he mean by it the Bishops of the several Diocesses in this Kingdom of *England*, 'tis like he cannot mean them, for they call themselves the Sons of the Church, and we look on the Church as that to which the last complaint must be made, for so our Saviour directs, *if thy Brother offend first tell him, then take with thee two or three, then tell the Church*, now if any one should injure a Bishop (as for my part I judge Mr. D. hath grievously injured every one of them by dedicating such a Volume of raileries to them) the Bishop must first tell him by himself, and then take with him two or three, and if he regard not them, then he must tell the Church, that is himself if a Bishop be the Church. 'Tis like by the Church he means the *Church representative*, or *Convocation*, now there is a Canon, that denounceth an heavy penalty against those, who deny the Convocation to be the Church of *England* by representation, and I am fully resolved not to come within the reach of that Canon, I love not excommengement. But if Mr. D. will take up the patronage of this Church Representative, his best way had been first to prove that it is the Church Representative, or else the *Presbyterians* will say that his whole discourse is *de non-ente*.

Mr. *Henry Jeanes* had before he knew how things went in the world set forth a treatise (which it was my hap to read over) asserting the obligation that lay upon *English* Divines, to comply with

the Church: but in his retractions and repent-  
 ings, thus he recalls himself, 'I wonder upon  
 'what account I or any man else could think the  
 'Convocation to be the Church of *England*; if  
 'in any sense it can be called the Church of *England*,  
 'it was because it represented the Ministry of *Eng-*  
 '*land*, and that it did not, because the far major  
 'part of it were Cathedral-men, Bishops, Deans,  
 'Arch-Deacons, and such as were chosen by the  
 'respective Chapters of each Cathedral: it might  
 'then be a Representation of the Cathedral Mini-  
 'sters, but not of the Ministry of *England*, and  
 'that I make good by two Parallels. The first  
 'shall be betwixt our Convocation, and the Coun-  
 'cil of *Trent*: many sober and moderate Papists  
 'accused this to be a pack'd Assembly, a Represen-  
 'tation of, not the Catholick Church, but the Court  
 'of *Rome*, because the greatest part of it were of  
 'the Popes Faction, and depended wholly upon  
 'him: So the major part of our Convocations were  
 'of the Bishops Faction, and minded chiefly the  
 'interest of Cathedrals: and therefore were  
 'not a Representative of all the Ministers in *Eng-*  
 '*land*. I shall exemplifie this by instancing in the  
 'Diocess of *Bathe and Wells*; wherein I lived: In  
 'this there were Members of the lower house of  
 'Convocation, one Dean, three Arch-Deacons, and  
 'one chosen by the Chapter of *Wells*: and to bal-  
 'lance these, there were but two Clerks chosen by  
 'the Ministry of the whole Diocess: Now what  
 'impartial man but will determine that these seven  
 'could be no due representation of the Ministers of  
 'the Diocess of *Bathe and Wells*, as long as five of  
 'them

' them were Members of the Cathedral, in whose  
 ' Election the Ministers of the Diocess had no hand  
 ' at all? A second parallel shall be betwixt our  
 ' Convocation and a civil Assembly, wherein we  
 ' will suppose that the Prince chuseth three hun-  
 ' dred, who are his Courtiers, or else such as have  
 ' their dependance, either wholly, or in great part  
 ' upon him, and the Nation chuse only a hundred:  
 ' you may call this Assembly a Parliament, or what  
 ' you will; but surely no rational man can think it  
 ' to be a representation of the Nation, and as ir-  
 ' rational, were it to call the Convocation a repre-  
 ' sentation of the Ministers of *England*, seeing those  
 ' chosen by the Ministers were an inconsiderable  
 ' part of the Convocation. Mr. D. belongeth to  
 a Cathedral, nay as report goes to several Cathed-  
 drals, and therefore he had done but a piece of  
 gratitude, to vindicate the Church from the Ar-  
 guments of a backslider from Conformity. Well,  
 let him mean what he will by his Holy Church of  
*England*, we are told that he himself is *Presbyter*  
*of this Holy Church of England*, and that is a strange  
 and very unusual phrase. Dr. Hammond, who de-  
 served well of the Hierarchy, in his Title page of  
 his Dissertations, calls himself, *Presbyterum An-*  
*glicanum*, and yet he was born in *England*, and or-  
 dained in *England*, and by an *English* Bishop. John  
 Durell was born in *Jersey*, ordained in *France*, and  
 by a *Scotish* Bishop, and yet he calls himself *Ecclesia*  
*Anglicana Presbyterum*. I doubt if things were  
 thoroughly searched into, he would appear to be  
 no *English Presbyter*, for we admit no Presbyters,  
 but those who are canonically ordained, *i. e.* by a

Bishop; you'll say Mr. D. was ordained by a Bishop, and he tells you the name of the Bishop, and his title: I know he doth, but I ask who made him a Bishop and a Presbyter? I much fear we shall find him one that was never ordained Presbyter but by Presbyters, or by those who had been themselves created Presbyters by meer Presbyters, though consecrated in *England* by Bishops; and if so, then *vitium prima consecrationis, non corrigitur in secundâ aut tertiâ*. Let him well consider this, and if occasion be, get himself re-ordained by some Bishop of *English* Blood and Ordination, else any one who envies him his preferments may chance to pick a hole in his coat. If he know not the Pedigree of the *Scottish* Bishops, it is in brief thus. In the year 1610, King *James* sent for Mr. *John Spotswood*, Mr. *Gawen Hamilton*, Mr. *Andrew Lamb* into *England*, that an Episcopal Character might be imprinted on them; to that end he issued out a Commission under the great Seal of *England*, to the Bishops of *London*, *Ely*, *Wells*, and *Rochester*, requiring them to proceed to the Consecration of three *Scotch*-men designed to be Bishops, which Consecration they did perform accordingly, *Octob.* 21. 1610. But Bishop *Andrews* moved a scruple how the persons to be consecrated, were capable of Episcopal Consecration, seeing none of them had been formerly ordained Priests. Dr. *Heylin* tells us *Hist. of Presb.* p. 387. *The scruple was removed by Archbishop Bancroft, alledging, that there was no such necessity of receiving Priesthood, but that Episcopal Consecrations might be given without it; but he neither tells us the Objection nor Answer aright:*  
the

the Objection was, That the three *Scots* could not be consecrated Bishops, because they had never been made Presbyters, but by Presbyters; to which *Bancroft* replied, That the Ordination of Presbyters by Presbyters was valid. But our present Bishops are not of the same mind, and therefore before they would consecrate Mr. *James Sharp*, they first ordained him Deacon, then Priest, and this they did not out of a pike or spleen against the man, but from judgement, conceiving he would not ordain others *legitimè*, unless he were so ordained; such as are by him ordained are capable regularly of preferment among us, but so are not any of the former brood of men, that were ordained by *Scotch* Bishops. This discourse is only designed to keep Mr. *D.* from despising the Presbyterians too much, to which he would be tempted if he should conceive himself to stand on a *base* as firm as some of his fellow Prebends. I advise him also not to be too forward to publish to the world how he hath let the Ministers of forreign Churches, Preach in his Church at the *Savoy*, for doubtless it is against the Act of Uniformity to let them Preach, though but occasionally in that Church, unless they have been ordained by some Bishops, because that Church at the *Savoy* hath submitted to the Bishop of *London* as Pastor, and so hath not the immunities, that other *French* Churches may claim, and do claim.

As to the Book it self, common fame spreads abroad, that an Answer in *Latin* is preparing for it. We must expect and see what kind of thing it will be; for we may well conceive it will discover Mr.

*D.* to

*D.* to be *John Lack-truth*, *John Lack-modesty*. Certain I am, there be School-boys in *England*, that can discover him to be no familiar of *Priscian*; we lay-men can manifest that he had no regard to truth; and for modesty, he doth all-along bid defiance to it. The Reverend *Gisbert Voet*, Professor of *Utrecht*, of eminent learning and piety, the only surviving member of the Synod of *Dort*, is with him but a pitifull fellow. He dares venture to censure *Thomas Gataker*, than whom *England* scarce ever had either a more exact Critick, or accomplished Divine. Nay, that you may see his pride to the full, he was not ashamed to tell an Honourable person of this Nation, that one reason which moved him to fall upon Mr. *Baxter* was, because the *Latin* Apologist for the Nonconformists, had represented him as no equal match for Mr. *Baxter*. Could you think it possible that Mr. *D.* should conceit himself meet to cope with such an Antagonist, whom the Reformed Divines (who can understand the language in which his books are written) admire; to whom *Amyrald* not long since sent a Letter on purpose to let him know that he had never spoken contemptibly of him. Mr. *Gaches* is sufficiently depredicated by Mr. *D.* as an Eloquent Preacher, and as one of the best men living. His Letter to Mr. *B.* is printed; by that let the world make estimation of him: or if Mr. *Gaches* testimonial can be discredited, then let the *Saints everlasting rest*, the *Treatise against Anabaptism*, and whatever else he hath written, be read and meditated upon seriously, there will scarce be found a Divine in whom there was a more happy con-



conjunction of eloquence and judgment, of holiness and peaceableness. Not to detain you long, I shall make a few general animadversions on the Book, and so put an end to these papers which are grown too big.

1. *The Author of the Vindiciæ egregiously violates the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion*, that buried all former miscarriages, he rakes them all out of the grave, as if he had no belief of the general judgment. If any *Presbyterians* made any application to such as in the late times took upon them supreme authority, he scores that up as an argument against *Presbytery*. Could any *Presbyterian* be so vile as to imitate him, how easily might he tell him of a Primate of *England*, and Metropolitan, who took up arms in the cause of the two Houses, and had a great sum voted him for his good service: Of a Conformist who was the prime Author of *Jus Divinum regiminis Ecclesiastici*: Of an Episcopal Divine now enjoying a good Living, who did write *Politica Sacra & Civilia*: Of sundry dignified men who came into sequestered places, and versified in behalf of the Protector. The late Wars began when I was a Child, and were finished before I was a man; but I have made the best enquiry that I could, and do find that sundry of the most eminent Nonconformists were alway unsatisfied about the Parliaments War, and did not stick as occasion was offered to declare their dissatisfaction. I have found also, that the Divines most busie to bring about the late unhappy and deplorable changes, were such as had been of the most rigid Sect of the Conformists; Mr. Ed-wards

wards in his *Gangrena* hath named some of them: I must not without leave from those who sit at the Stern, do so; but I profess I know not that Theologue who did either speak or write for putting of the King to death, that had not been a Conformist before the Wars. The men now in place who lost any thing for refusing the Engagement, will be found to be very few; some will be found to come into the places of those who were turned out for not engaging. Dr. *Heylin* himself (as hot as he is against those who go by the name of *Presbyterians*) did Anno 1657. put forth his *Ecclesia vindicata*, much of such a strain as Mr. *Durell's Vindicie*; in the general Preface to that Book, he addresseth himself to those who were then in power, and pleads for the men of his persuasion, by this argument, *That they lived so peaceably and inoffensively in their several stations, as that they could not be reproached with any disaffection to the then present Government in word or deed.* Had some eminent man called a *Presbyterian*, said so much for those of his persuasion, what would Mr. *D.* have made of it? But the Reformed Religion may say, *All these things are against me.* Mr. *D.* makes the Principles of the *English Presbyterians* to lead to Rebellion. Dr. *Owen* long since equalized the *Puritans* beyond the seas, with the *Jesuits*, in point of disloyalty. Dr. *Heylin* in his *History of Presbyterians*, hath driven the same nail further and deeper; nothing is wanting but some hot-headed fellow among the Protestants to lay Treason at the door of the *Lutherans*, and then the cry of the *Romanists* will be fulfilled. But still the *English*  
Pro-

Protestant will be white as snow ; in vain is it so to think. The Parliament of *England* hath determined the matter of the Militia, and declared it unlawful on any account whatsoever to take up Arms against the King. Men will acquiesce in this Declaration, if not for Conscience-sake, yet at least for fear. I know no Book put out since his Majesties return, that hath asserted the lawfulness of subjects rising against their Sovereign, but one set forth as *Mr. Rich. Hookers*, and dedicated with the rest of his Works by Bishop *Gauden* to the King himself. *Mr. Isaac Walton* would have us think the Book is not his ; and I wish he had brought better arguments to bring us to that persuasion. But I am sure that Bishop *Bilson* hath left things upon record which may vye with any thing quoted out of *Calvin* or *Beza*, by *Dr. Heylin*.

2. This Vindex when he meets in the Apologist with that he dares not justify, presently puts it into his Catalogue of Legends, yet brings no probable arguments to prove it a Legend. The Apologist, whoever he was, seems to have written his Book under much bodily weakness, and hath pleaded for his brethren in Nonconformity rather honestly than fully ; but as for the things that *Mr. D.* calls fables, I myself know many, if not all of them, to be true, and dare undertake to produce those who will attest them upon oath ; yet if I could meet with the Apologist handsomely, I would severely rebuke him for putting some of them into print, for all truths are not to be published at all times. I remember I once heard him that is the reputed Author of the *Apology*, say in  
a Ser-

a Sermon, *A man can scarce do a worse office to the Church, than to render Pastors despicable in the eyes of those whom they are to govern.*

3. This Vindex when he falls into the mention of any Controversie that should be debated by him, takes his heels, and runs away from it, and drops some question about the which there was never any dispute. Twenty and ten instances might be given of this kind; I only take notice of one; he hath a Chapter *utris magis fauerit Calvinus*, &c. Whether Calvin most favoured the Schismatical Presbyterians, or Prelates? If this be to answer the Apologist, then let some one that replies, put a question, Whether Calvin most favoured Arminian Prelates, or Presbyterians? What hath Schism to do in the Controversie about Nonconformity? The greater part of Nonconformists cannot be guilty of Schism, except they were guilty of it in their mothers womb, or when they sucked; or whilst they were School-boys: for thus the case stood with them; they were by their Parents sent to the University when Bishops were *inter non-entia*, or *inter non apparentia*. By study they came to acquire those gifts that were supposed to qualifie them for the Ministry; to the work of the Ministry they were seperated by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery; yet many of them never declared dislike of Episcopacy, nor opened their mouths against Ceremonies; never took the Covenant nor Engagement; were presented to vacant Livings by the true and undoubted Patrons: By Gods blessing they added to the Church such as should be saved. His Majesty

stics  
musi  
cal  
scar  
mist  
byte  
Sch  
O  
Mr.  
pay  
writ  
A  
R  
to h  
to f  
one  
with  
hear  
seas  
him  
some  
comp  
plied  
the  
wort  
Mr.  
possi  
ance  
thor  
old  
wha  
to m  
rier

sties return they desired so as none more; yet they must not be suffered to continue in an Ecclesiastical Benefice, unless they will submit to a thing scarce ever heard of, *Reordination*. It may be their mistake that they do not judge Ordination by Presbyters to be a nullity; but what is this to Schism?

*Obj.* I may expect you will thus accost me: If Mr. D. be so easily mastered, why do you not pay a debt of love you owe? why do you not write in *Latin* as once Mr. *Nichols* did in *English*, *A Plea for the Innocent*?

*Resp.* Verily for this reason, because I love not to have to do with those, who when they are put to silence, know not how to be ashamed; such a one this *Monsieur* is; for not long ago he met with a Noble Gentleman of this Nation, who hearing him say, *That all the Divines beyond seas condemned the English Nonconformists*, told him plainly, *That he knew it was not so; and that some in France looked on him as an apostate for complying so far as he had done*; and when he replied, *These are only some unwise hot-headed men*; the honourable person rejoined, *Nay, they are worthy and well tempered Ministers*. Yet did not Mr. D. change the copy of his countenance. Is it possible then that I should bring him to repentance? In a word, if you account Mr. D. an Author any way considerable, you have near you our old friend S. E. let him cull out of the *Vindicie* what he esteemeth most strong, that do you send to me, if I do not by the first return of the Carrier send you a satisfactory answer (provided it be

be directed not against persons, but the Cause) then account me a very vain-glorious animal. In the mean time listen not to those who are given to vain jangling; and false-witness bearing, but put on charity the bond of perfection, so shall an abundant entrance be administered unto you into that Kingdom, where there are no perverse disputers; to that Kingdom that we may be both brought, is the sincere prayer of,

S I R,

*Your humble servant,*

W. B.

Long

**L**ong time after I had written the Appendix against Dr. *Heylin*, I was informed, that something else was come abroad in *Latin*, in the which the Nonconformists were concerned. I could not think any thing was said in it, that had not been said before, and therefore I had once some thoughts, never so much as to look into it; but being told that the Author of it was Mr. *Matthew Scrivener*, reputed at *Cambridge* (while he there resided) a close Student, and great Scholar; I resolved, to cast my eye upon some Pages of it, that so, if it seemed written with any candor and judgement, I might either give an answer to it, or tell such Nonconforming friends, as I was acquainted with, that I found it unanswerable. But looking into it, at the Stationers shop, I soon found it to be made up of little besides scurrility and calumny. Monsieur *Daillees* Book of the *Right use of the Fathers*, which I thought no Protestant had looked on without admiration, nor Papist without terror, this *English* Presbyterian undertakes to answer, endeavours first of all to make it appear, that the Book deserved not the *Elogiums* that some of great name and esteem among us had bestowed upon it, and that Mr. *Daillee* was but a *Cham*, taking delight to lay open the nakedness of the *Fathers*. Then proceeds to give him a general and particular answer. I confess I was moved

L

not

not a little, to see a writer that had deserved so well of the Reformed Religion, so unworthily dealt with, by one pretending to be a Protestant. For what one thing hath Mr. *J. D.* said more or less about the Fathers, than what had been said many years before by some of our most eminent Divines in *England*? It must be acknowledged, that he hath handled the point more copiously, than any who went before him; and the heads of his discourse are exemplified with a most admirable collection of particulars; but that he hath brought the Fathers any one peg lower than they had been brought by *Juel, Humfred, Whitaker, Rainolds, Dr. George Abbot, Down, &c.* will never be proved. Bishop *Cosins* hath put together all the reasons that were scattered and dispersed in other mens writings, to prove the Non-canonicalness of the Apocryphal Books; now it would be no wonder if a Protestant in some writing should *obiter* take notice, that the Bishop in some particular had mistook himself; but he that should professedly undertake to answer him, would scarce be accounted other than a Papist. *e. c.* The Bishop saith, p. 18. *All the Canonical Books of the Old Testament were originally written in Hebrew (except &c.) but these other books (he means those canonized at Trent) were all confessedly first written in the Greek tongue, &c.* I may doubt whether all the controverted books were first written in the *Greek* tongue, I may confidently affirm this is not confessed concerning all the controverted books (for who knows not that *Ecclesiasticus* is generally affirmed to be written first in *Hebrew*,



*Hebrew*, to say nothing of other books) and yet not be thought spiteful nor Popish; but if I should publish a whole book against the Bishop, labouring to lessen his reputation and esteem, to weaken the authorities by him produced, would not any man say, that either I was a Papist, or that I cared not how much I gratified the Papist, so I could but show my teeth against Bishop *Cosins*? yet just such a game it is that Mr. *Scrivener* plays.

*Obj.* But if what he hath said against *Daillee* be truth, if his answers to him be rational, is it not meet he should be honoured? Will it not be for our credit and reputation, to let the *Papists* know, that we will not spare our own, how renowned soever, where they exceed the bounds of modesty and sobriety?

*Ans.* If any one through a zeal (without knowledg) against Popery, shall say those things against the Fathers that may discourage those who have leisure and money from buying and reading of them; or so weaken their authority, as to prejudice the interest of Christianity; he doth deserve praise and commendation who shall endeavour to bring the Fathers to their due esteem. But neither hath Mr. *Daillee* wronged the Fathers, nor Mr. *Scrivener* righted them: but because Mr. *Scrivener* heard a Presbyterian in a Sermon put off an objection taken from the authority of the Fathers by referring his hearers to Mr. *Daillee*; therefore he resolves to encounter Mr. *Daillee*. And as spleen seems to be the chief thing that put him on this undertaking, so in the managing of it he hath discovered more of petulant spleen,

spleen, than of judgment. This censure I had some purpose to make good, but that 1. I am assured that *Daillee* is like in a short time to be vindicated by some of his own. 2. I am now also fallen into a place where I can have no books but what my own Library affords; and though I have most of the ancient Fathers of some Edition, yet in a matter of this nature, I shall neither be able to satisfy my self nor others, unless I had opportunity to consult all the Editions of them, or at least the most renowned. For it often happeneth, that when a man thinketh he hath the Fathers on his side, and hath brought their testimonies too plain to be eluded for his opinion, he reapeth no benefit thereby, because those who differ from him, deny the copies according to which he proceedeth, to be such as are to be relied on. It was my hap not long since to read Dr. *Waltons Prolegomena*, that I might see what he could say for the comparative novelty of the *Hebrew Letters* that we at present use; among other arguments I found him to make use of the authority of *Eusebius* his *Chronicle ad annum mundi 4740*. the words quoted out of him are these, *Fuit Esdras eruditissimus legis divine, & clarus omnium Judaeorum magister, qui de captivitate regressi fuerunt in Judeam: affirmaturq; divinas Scripturas memoriter condidisse, & ut Samaritanis non miscerentur literas Judaicas commutasse.* What is his collection hence? why this, *Hic videmus Eusebium non tantum hanc literarum mutationem diserte asserere, sed etiam ejus causam adferre, ut sc. Judaicum Samaritanis non miscerentur.* I could see no such disert or manifest assertion of the change of the Letters in this testimony of *Eusebius*. He that only

only faith *affirmatur*, cannot be concluded so much as to deliver his own opinion. Many Historians and Chronographers use *affirmatur*, or some word of like import in such matters as they themselves do not believe, and I hope for the credit of *Eusebius* that he did not think *Esdras divinas scripturas memoriter condidisse*; and if so, it is not like that he believed the other part of the affirmation neither. But Mr. *Baily*, a learned and industrious Scotch-man, in his lately published Historical and Chronological Work, lib. 1. p. 197. tells me, 'That he had read 'over and over *Eusebius* his Chronicle, as well the 'Greek as the Latin Copy set forth by *Scaliger*, 'with great care out of the best Manuscripts, and 'could not find one word in them concerning this 'change of Letters by *Esdras*; and yet if *Scaliger* had in any Copy of good repute found any 'thing that might have confirmed this change of 'Letters, he would no doubt have inserted it, because he doth with so much passion take upon him 'to defend that change. Now if this be true, as I doubt it is, that Dr. *Walton* in his prologue to so renowned a Work as the *Polyglotts*, followed a Translation of *Eusebius* that was corrupted, I may well be affrighted from examining testimonies of Fathers, till I be where I may be assured that the testimonies I am to examine are not counterfeited. In the mean time I shall lay down some few things concerning the Fathers.

1. Many times the usefulness and almost absolute necessity of being acquainted with the Oriental Languages and the Writings of the Fathers, is most cried up by those who themselves are but strangers to them. It is not many years since a son

of the Church at a Lecture in the Countrey, Preach-  
 ed up the necessity of the knowledge of the Original  
*Hebrew*, affirming that they were not worthy the  
 name of Divines who did not well understand it;  
 but this pert young man being at Dinner taken to  
 task about his own skill in *Hebrew*, it was found  
 that he could not so much as read *Hebrew*; yet he  
 was out-done by the bold *Jesuit*, who (as *Mel-*  
*chior Adam* relates the story in his life, pag. 845.)  
 in a Dispute with *Graferus* about the *Hebrew* Text  
 of the Bibles, made boast of his skill in *Hebrew*;  
 but this Father of the society having an *Hebrew* Bi-  
 ble without points put into his hands, knew not  
 which was the top, which was the bottom of the  
 Pages, which occasioned *Graferus* his Scholar to  
 laugh at his daring ignorance; so that the Noble-  
 man who brought this Father, withdrew, and wish'd  
 him, so ignorant, to be gone. They who have read  
 the reasons of *Edmund Campian*, cannot but know  
 how much he boasted of the Fathers, as if they  
 had been all his own from first to last, even as  
 much as *Gregory* the 13th: on this account he  
 earnestly desired to be admitted to dispute with  
 our Divines. *Quo quo se moverit adversarius, feret*  
*incommodum: Patres admiserit captus est; Excluserit,*  
*nullus est.* But when this vain-glorious creature  
 came to be disputed with, it was found that he  
 could not understand a *Greek* Father, and that it  
 might well be questioned whether he could so much  
 as read *Greek*. Dr. *Fulk* plainly tells him in the  
 third days conference, that it was not above a dozen  
 years since he heard him at *Oxford* ask a Stationer  
 for *Irenaus's* Epistles. In the fourth days conference,  
 when

when Mr. *Clark* brought *Tertullians* Book against *Hermogenes* to prove the Scriptures sufficiency, he knew of no such book, and yet when he was convinced that there was such a book, then he could answer, and pretended to know upon what account *Tertullian* argued against *Hermogenes*? And he pretended in the same days conference, that he knew the meaning of *St. Basil*, and yet would not, or could not read the place in *Greek*, though it were easie, and the sentence short, and though he knew not where to find it in the *Latin* book. So it seemed not improbable to some that *Campion* made not that confident Pamphlet, but only turned it into good *Latin*. *Thompson* also in his Treatise *de Amissione & Intercissione justificationis, & gratie*, musters up the testimonies of many Fathers; but when his book was only manuscript, one who knew him, asked him this question, *Unde tot Patrum testimonia usurparet, qui patres vix quidem attigisset?* I could shew the like ignorance and confidence in another *Arminian*, who troubled Mr. *Robert Bailly* of Scotland, with testimonies of Fathers against Predestination, but such as were all taken out of *Vossius*, and concluded them with an *Item*, that *Beza* and *Calvin* acknowledged the Fathers to be against themselves, quoting as *Vossius* through an oversight had done, *Beza* on *Rom. 9. 39.* when as that Chapter hath but 33 Verses in it. And *Calvins* third book of Institutions 33 Chapter, when there be but 25 Chapters in that whole book. I could also discover a great many now living who carry it in their Sermons and Discourses, as if they followed the ancient Fathers, when

indeed they follow none but *Hugh Groot*. But would I by all this insinuate, that Mr. *Scriver* is not well versed in the Fathers, for whom he Apologizeth? I answer, I would insinuate no more, but that it is possible that all his pretended zeal for the Fathers may be without any great knowledge of them. What the course of his Studies hath been, I know not, his friends were wont to think, that his genius led him rather to School-men, than Fathers ( if it did so, he is not the worse to be liked; for of the two, a Minister who hath the cure of souls, may better want Patristical than Scholastical Theology ); I suppose it would a little decompose his gravity to be catechized any whit strictly, concerning the age, stile and design of some of the Fathers whom he undertakes to defend; if in this I be mistaken, the matter is not great, for I design it only to keep our Priests from boasting of a false gift.

2. I never yet in all my life met with any person of any perswasion whatsoever, that would recede from any opinion he had at first imbibed, because one or more Fathers were against him. We all first take up our opinions from the Catechisms, or Confessions that are authorized in those Churches of which we are members, and many, that I say not most, go all their days by an implicit faith, believing as the Church believes, and as their Ministers do Preach, never taking pains to search whether they agree to the Canon of Faith. *Popish* Divines think that their Church cannot err, and so strain all their learning and diligence to defend what she hath determined; all that call themselves Protestants,

testants, say they ought to use their judgement of discretion, though they may be bound, if in some comparatively less matters, they have knowledge different from the Church in which they are Ministers, to have it to themselves. This is truth, but the men who do conscientiously and impartially make use of their judgement of discretion, are not very many, they are very soon tyed up by subscriptions, and account it not for their credit to recede from them; if in disputation they be pressed with the authority of the Fathers or ancient Doctors, they either bluntly declare that they little regard them, or else find out some plausible *salvo*, or *σῶσθι φάσματι* to elude them.

1. Some will flatly declare that they do not much matter what mind the Fathers are of. The great Patron of Ubiquity *Jacobus Andraas* is reported by *Sculterus* in his *Nuncupatory* to his *Medula*, not to value the Fathers at all, *Athanasius* with him was *Sathanasius*, *Vigilius*, *Dormilius*, and all the *Patres* he would in contempt call *Matres*, that is, I suppose, weak and silly creatures, unfit to be used as guides and directors in matters of Religion. The Papists themselves, as great a shew as they sometimes make of Fathers, do at other times use language not much more civil concerning them. Was it not a Pope of Rome that declared his esteem of the learning of *Thomas Aquinas* to be so great, that he doubted not to give unto him the first place after the Canonical Scripture? Such a Speech is fathered upon one of the *Innocents* by *Augustin Hunne*, if I may credit Dr. G. Abbot against *Hill*, Pag. 426. and I suppose I may well credit

credit him, because I find as much in *Alvarez de Auxiliis*, lib. 1. pag. 52. Indeed to almost all truly and thoroughly Popish Writers, the Fathers are but Children, his Holiness, as they call him, is all in all with them. *Suarez* in 3<sup>a</sup> Com. 1. qu. 2. not. 2. disp. 42. sect. 1. saith, The definition of the Pope is altogether true; and if it should be contrary to the sayings of all Saints, it were to be preferred to them. *Bellar.* lib. 4. de Pon. cap. 5. If the Pope should err by commanding vices, or prohibiting virtues, the Church would be bound to believe vices to be good, and virtues bad, unless she would sin against her conscience. *Cornelius Mus* in his Comments on the Romans, p. 606. e. g. I, to confess ingenuously, would more believe the Pope alone in those things which concern the mysteries of faith, than a thousand Austins, Hieroms, Gregories, &c. because the Pope in matters of faith cannot err. Much such ranting stuff I could quote, did I count it needful; but indeed it is not needful, for his Holiness takes upon him to have a power to correct Fathers, that they may just fit and suit the present state of his Church. By the Constitution of *Sixtus* the Fifth, care is taken to set out Fathers free from the corruptions they have contracted by coming through the hands of Hereticks, but with this proviso, That if any more weighty doubts and difficulties shall happen in the authority of old Books, in the correction and emendation of books, things being first examined in the Congregation, they should be referred to him, that in variety of readings he might determine that by a special privilege granted to his See, which was most consonant to orthodox verity: and lest we should think that

the



the Pope must determine nothing of his own head, but after he hath taken great pains, hear *Gregory de Valentia Analysis fidei*, lib. 8. p. 70. *Non est ratio ulla firma quamobrem existimare debeamus, studii diligentiam Pontifici esse necessariam, sive in definiendo studium adhibeat sive non adhibeat, infallibiliter certe definit.* But this it may be is said but by one, and a long time since; not so, we shall find our Countrey-man *Thomas Baton*, or *Southwell* in his *Analysis fidei* saying as much.

But do not *Calvinists* as much set at naught the Fathers when they make not for them?

*Ans.* So they are charged to do by Papists, and the Remonstrants, and their adherents. *Campion* saith, *Causens* called *Dionysius* the *Arcopagite* a dotting old man; but *Dr. Humphred* denies him to have used any such broad language even of the pretended *Dionysius*, *De Patribus*, p. 520, &c. *Grotius* also gives them such a bob pag. 15. *Piet. Illus. Ordin. Hollandie*, but quoteth no Author that gave him any occasion to vent such a reproach.

2. Some hating to speak contemptibly of the Fathers, will civilly put off their authority, either by putting another sense on their words than is commonly given, or by blaming the edition, or the translation, or by opposing one Father to another, or the same Father to himself, or by saying that he relates the opinion of others: So that they do by them, just as they do at *Oxford* by *Aristotle*, his authority must not be denied in disputations under a penalty appointed by the Statutes, yet any one in *Parvissis*, or *Augustinensibus* holds the opinion that he best liketh, how contrary soever it be to

*Ari-*

*Aristotle*; and if *Aristotle* be urged against him, *Loquitur ad modum vulgi, disputative, non doctrinaliter, &c.* serves well enough to put him by, and shift him off.

The day is yet, I suppose, to come that ever any Scholar in disputation said, *I find that Aristotle is against me, and therefore I do revoke and recall my opinion, promising to be of another mind for the future.* If the Roman Catholicks do not use the Fathers just so, then let me be accounted to bear false witness against them. In the general that caution of the Belgick Censors is well known, and extant in the Chapter concerning *Bertram*. *In veteribus aliis plurimos ferimus errores, & extenuamus, excusamus excogitato commento, persepe negamus & commodum eis sensum affingimus, dum opponuntur in disputationibus aut in conflictionibus cum adversariis.* This affixing of a commodious sense to the Fathers, is a shield that will quench all darts; by help of this, *Bellarmino* thought himself able to avoid the general Propositions of the Fathers, concerning the extent of Original sin, so as to leave room and place for the immaculate conception of the Virgin *Mary*, *De Amis. Grat. Lib. 4. cap. 15.* I wonder, having found out such a shield, he would ever part with it. What need he say *de Sanct. Beat. 1. Cap. 6.* concerning *Juslin, Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Oecumenius*, I see not how I can defend them; or concerning *Lactantius*, that he fell into many errors, especially about the age to come, being more skilful in the books of *Tully* than in the holy Scriptures; or concerning *Victorinus*, that he wanted learning, but not a will to learning, *Lib. eodem cap. 5.* Why are *Procopius, Eucherius, Isidorus*

*Isidorus branded to be uncertain Authors, or obscure, Lib. de Purg. 2. cap. 6. Why is it said of Origen, that his words on the 14th Homily on Luke do not bear a commodious exposition, de Pur. lib. 2. cap. 1. p. 630. Origen was one of the first that brought in Purgatory fire; and could Bellarmine find out no commodious sense of his words concerning those that are to be purged by it? Could he not say that he related only the opinion of others, as he doth concerning Hierom? Lib. de gratia primi hominis, cap. 11. or that he spake hyperbolically, as he brings off Chrysostom, lib. 2. de Miss. cap. 10. or that he did write after the manner of Poets, which he saith about Prudentius, lib. 2. de Purg. cap. 18. Why could he not say, that writing against one extreme, he fell into the other extreme; a *salvo* often brought when some of the Fathers sayings are brought, that seem to favour Manichæism or Pelagianism, Arrianism or Sabellianism. If no such thing would serve the turn, why then it might have been said, that he spoke ἰσοματικῶς ἀπὸ ἀγνοητικῶς, a distinction used by St. Basil to fetch off Gregory, Epis. 64. but made use of by more than one Papist; or rather than fail, it might have been said, that Origen was abused and corrupted.*

Q. What then, is no authority to be ascribed to the Fathers?

A. There may be authority enough ascribed to them, notwithstanding any thing I have said; for I have only related how men deal with the Fathers, not how they ought to deal with them. Yet I confess I am somewhat to seek how to draw such an argument from the authority of the Fathers, as

none

none but desperate persons will think invalid. Should I, meeting with an Adversary that differs from me, argue thus, *Austin says it is so, therefore so it is*; or *Austin saith it is not so, therefore it is not so*: My antecedents I may chance to prove, if I have such an Edition of *Austin* by me, as is liable to no exception; but my arguments to be sure would be denied, and how shall I prove them, by asking him whether he account himself wiser than *Austin*? he will, if he be wise, ask me, whether I will subscribe to every thing that he can bring a place of *Austin* for? and I, if I be not a fool, shall not promise so to do; so is our argument at an end. But perhaps if I had argued from consent of Fathers, then he must when I had proved such consent, have yielded to me, or else he might justly be reputed contentious and self-conceited. I must needs acknowledg that the testimony of many Fathers to a point, is more considerable, than the testimony of any one Father to the same point. And yet sometimes one may so practise upon many, that those many who join with him, may justly be reputed to signifie no more than himself alone, or rather not so much as himself alone; for he that goes about to trapan others into a consent with him, may well be thought not to be himself; there may be a good appeal from a man engaged to make a party, and carry on a design, to the same man under no such engagement. Sometimes also it is too too apparent, that after one Father had written his opinion upon a matter, others have chosen rather to follow him, than to be at the pains to enquire whether he

was

was to be followed. But be this as it will : when is it we may reckon our selves to have the consent of Fathers ? I suppose when we hold that which all or the most of the Fathers did hold manifestly, frequently, constantly, no others contradicting them. If such a consent as this be not almost impossible to be had in the questions now disputed among Christians, then must I needs confess my self much mistaken in the collections I have made out of the Writings of the Fathers. But it will be good for the further clearing of this business, to instance in particulars, that we may know how much we are bound to follow Fathers.

1. There be some matters purely philosophical; how much is to be attributed to the consent of the Fathers in these ? Must we concern our selves before we come to be of any opinion about them, to enquire what their sentiments concerning them were ? Had the Fathers such clear conceptions in Physicks, Metaphysicks, Mathematicks, that he who departs from them, must needs be thought to be in an error ? If so, I know no Sect of Philosophers that must not be judged to abound with errors. *Cornelius à Lapide* tells us, that *Basil, Theodoret, Nazianzen*, did all hold that Light was created by God out of any subject, and thence notes against Hereticks, *That accidents can in the Eucharist exist without a subject*. As for *Basil*, I think notwithstanding all the pains *Bellarmino* takes *De Euch. lib. 3. cap. 24.* to make him of that opinion, he is well enough brought off by *Scultetus*. *Theodoret* I have not by me, and will not guess what his

his mind' was. *Nazianzen* in his 43. *Orat.* εἰς τὴν κυριακὴν καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸ ἑσπ., &c. hath these words concerning that Light, καὶ τὸτο ἐκ ὁργανοῦ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐστὶ ἡδύατον, ὡς ὁ ἡμεῖς λυγροί, ἀλλ' ἀσώματος καὶ ἀνόητον, ἐπὶ τὴν δὲ καὶ ἡλὶς δοθέν, some of which words sound suspiciously, yet perhaps do not necessarily infer, that he conceived Light to be a quality existing without a subject; if they do, he saith plainly it was but his own private opinion. But now suppose all these three, and three and twenty more Fathers had been of this mind, must I be thought proud if I did not forthwith allow the possibility of an accident's subsisting without a subject? If I must, *jacta est alea*, I am resolved in all such cases not to purchase a reputation of humility by disclaiming my reason. *Lactantius* and *Austin* do with some zeal oppose the *Antipodes*, and laugh at the assertors of them. Venerable *Bede* treads in their steps. As for Pope *Zachary* who got into the Chair about the year 750. his zeal against the *Antipodes* was so furious, that nothing less would satisfy it, than the condemning of *Virgilius*, a Bishop in *Bavaria*, as an Heretick, because he adventured to assert, that there were men whose feet were opposite to ours. *Fromund* in his *Anti-aristarchus* is troubled at this story, and takes some pains to qualify it so, as that it may not derogate from the Popes infallibility.

I shall not be offended with any man that can prove there never was a Pope who thought it heresie to hold the Earth to be round. And I am glad the Church of *Rome* now-a-days allows her followers more liberty in matters of Philosophy, than formerly;

formerly ; for the more liberty is allowed to men of that persuasion, though but in Philosophy, the more hopes may we conceive of their coming over to us.

But I see plainly that the ancient Fathers did look upon the roundness of the Earth as a paradox ; and it is not many years since a Divine in *England* writing against the morality of the Sabbath, laid down abundance of propositions which were every one of them false, the plainness of the earth not being supposed.

However, I am resolved to adhere to demonstration and history, say the Fathers and their admirers what they will to the contrary. To be short, so far as I can judge, the Fathers were not the best Philosophers that ever the world enjoyed.

2. What is to be attributed to the consent of Fathers in matters of Chronology ? Surely not very much : for being generally unacquainted with the *Hebrew*, and following none of the best Copies of the *Septuagint*, they miserably failed in the Age of the *Antediluvian* Patriarchs. All good men can easily pardon that their error ; some of late have gone about to justify their account, but upon such weak grounds, that I should much wonder if among Scholars they should have many followers. The Learned world will not easily yield that all the *Hebrew* Copies we now use, are corrupted, *Gen. 5.* and to be amended by the *Septuagint*.

3. What is to be attributed to the Fathers in matters Historical ? To answer this it would be enquired, 1. How far they thought themselves concerned to report truth. 2. Of what prudence

M

they

they were. For if any of them thought an officious lye lawful, there is no relying upon the History written by him; and that none of the Fathers thought an officious lye lawful, I am not he that will affirm; I rather fear that some of them did make no scruple to use pious frauds, the more to set off Christian Religion to those Heathens against whom they did write. He that hath any nose may smell something of this officiousness in sundry of those miracles that are left on record by Ecclesiastical Writers. 2. If any of them did think that they might not lye, no not *in negotiis* *negotii*; yet if they were credulous, and apt to be abused by cunning men, they might report things far from truth, which yet upon their credit and reputation would be taken for true in succeeding generations. What an incredible story doth *Justin Martyr* in his Exhortation to the *Greeks* tell us, concerning the 72. Interpreters, viz. That the King who sent for them, appointed them to be kept in distinct Cells, not suffering them to speak with one another, and yet that their interpretation at last was found not only to agree in sense, but in every word. This he relates to the *Grecians* not without great confidence, saying that he had seen some footsteps of the Cells in the Island where they were first built, and referring himself to *Josephus* and *Philo*, and other Historians. And yet *Philo* makes no mention of these Cells into which they were severally put; and *Josephus* speaks of their conferring together, as *Aristean* had done before him. 'Tis like some *Jews* had abused honest *Justin* into a belief of this figment; and that

*Irenaeus*,



*Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Cyrill, Hilary,* securely followed *Justin*. Not is this the only instance of false stories transmitted to us by the Fathers. Mean time it is a piece of Justice due to the Fathers that follow *Justin* in the matter of the Cells, and the Interpreters consent to a word, to let my Reader know that they do not follow him in his stupendous *Anachronism* of *Ptolemies* sending to *Herod King of the Jews* (as he reports) when the Translation was to be made. The Learned *Francis Junius* in his *Animadversions on Bellarmine*, endeavours to salve *Justin's* credit in this matter; but whether Mr. *Scrivener* will like his *salvo*, he best knows.

4. What is to be attributed to the Fathers in expounding of Scripture? Must we not take that to be the true sense of a Text, which they have generally pitched upon? *Ans.* To find out the true sense and meaning of the Spirit of God in any Text not very obvious, in an ordinary way 'tis necessary that a man should have a good skill in Logick, so as to be able to analyse well; and that he should be well seen in those Languages in which the inspired Penmen did write. As for knowledge in Logick, the most of the Fathers did not abound in that; I could instance in one Modern Logician, from whom a Scholar may have more help for analysing Scripture, than from all the Fathers put together. And for skill in the Oriental Languages, every one will acknowledge that most of the Fathers had but little. *Origen* and *Hierome* understood *Hebrew*, so did few of the Ancients besides; and it will be no disparagement to *Origen*

or *Hierome* to say, that there are hundreds in the world at present that understand that Language far better than either of them ever did, or were in any near capacity to do.

The *Greek* Fathers must needs be supposed well to understand the *Greek* Tongue in which the whole New Testament was written; but so did very few of the *Latin* Fathers. I will not say who it was that derived ἀπόστολος from ἀπὸ and σόλος. So gross ignorance do not all the *Latin* Fathers bewray; but they who have *Erasmus* his Commentaries by them, will find quickly that the Fathers of the *Latin* Church are not the best guides to follow in interpreting Scripture. One Exposition of *Austin* not taken notice of by *Erasmus*, I will here mention. The Apostle saith *Rom. 3. 27. that boasting is excluded*; that is, hath no place; but that Learned Father finding the word *exclusa*, runs away with it till he hath quite lost the Apostles sense, *Exclusa, non ut abscederet pulsa, sed ut emereret expressa.*

5. What is to be attributed to the Fathers in matters of Doctrine or Faith? *Ans.* 1. I shall readily grant that to be no fundamental Doctrine or Article of Faith which is denied by many Fathers. 2. If I find any doctrine pretty unanimously asserted by Fathers, though I see no foundation for it in Scripture, I shall not think my self concerned to oppose that doctrine, till I find something in Scripture that it contradicts. But I am also certain, that most of the Fathers (that I say not all) had their errors, and some of them so gross, that he who should now hold them, would scarce be thought

thought meet to be a Church-officer. Therefore I am resolved to study Scripture with care and conscience, and on that to build my faith. In so doing I shall be sure to obey my Saviours precept; and I may promise my self the assistance of the Spirit, whose office it is to lead me into all truth. And if those doctrines that I have good assurance be grounded on Scripture, be charged with novelty and singularity, then shall I rejoice if I can find the Fathers consenting with me. Other good ends I can propound to my self in reading of the Fathers; but the main end I aim at, is to stop the mouth of gainsayers, especially those who glory in Antiquity, and make consent of Fathers their rule. I will not reject any truth because it is but newly discovered, nor yet embrace any error because it is of long continuance, or because some great and good man had the ill hap to be the first Author of it. Never shall any Sacinian have occasion to say of me, as I find it by one of that Sect objected to the Reformed, *Scripturam sacram ex illorum (Patrum Conciliorumq;) mente explicant. Ab illis doctrinæ capita repetunt. Illorum auctoritate confirmant. Neq; adversus Pontificios tantum, sed & adversus eos disputantes, qui à Patribus se dissentire non inficiantur, perpetuum illum Patrum Conciliorumq; consensum perpetuo crepant; Eosq; qui Patribus illis olim Conciliisq; contra dixerunt, tanquam Hereticos merito damnatos esse censent. Neq; Patres propterea recipiunt, quia cum scripturâ consentiunt, sed scripturam eo intelligendam modo censent, quia Patres ita explicarunt.* Ideoq; prius de unanimi Pa-

trum Conciliorumq; consensu, quam de vero scripturæ sensu sunt solliciti. Nec desunt qui affirmare non dubitant, etsi sacra literæ illorum adversari sententia manifestè viderentur: si tamen Patres Conciliaq; secus eas intellexerint, malle se Patribus istis Conciliisq; adherere, quam privatum suum, uti vocant, de scripturis sequi iudicium. Neq; illi è fece sunt; sed qui ad summum in Theologia gradum conscenderunt. I will judg from Scripture what is truth, and unto what degree any truth is necessary; but when I have found any opinion to be contrary to Scripture, I shall be the more confident that I was not mistaken in accounting the opinion erroneous, when I have found it condemned as such by many or all the Fathers that speak of it.

3. There are but few against whom the Fathers are so frequently and fiercely quoted, that need fear tryal by the Fathers.

By saying there are but few, I intimate there are some; in that number I place,

1. The *Socinians*, against whom I conceive the whole stream of Antiquity doth run very strongly; for though some would have the doctrine of the Trinity as it is commonly delivered in Christian Churches, to be no older than the *Nicene Council*; and though it cannot be denied but that divers of the Fathers who flourished before that Council, have left in their Writings sundry ill sounding propositions; yet if a man interpret their sayings candidly, and remember that the signification of some Theological terms is somewhat varied since their times, he shall be forced

to acknowledg that they all agreed in this, That the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and all three but one God. To demonstrate this consent against a late wretched discourse called *Historia enucleata*, would be an employment well worthy Mr. *Scrivener's* pains, if he be so well versed in the ancient Fathers as he makes shew; till he or some other will be at that pains, the English Reader may help himself sufficiently from Mr. *Estwick*.

The greatest doubt seems to be about *Origen*, whom sundry of the Church of Rome make an *Arian*. *Bellarmino* mentions out of *Pratum Spirituale*, a vision, in the which he was seen in hell with *Arius* and *Nestorius*. *de Purg. lib. 2. c. 8.* where he also affirms, that the fifth Synod condemned him as an Heretick. *Aquinas* in his 1a. *quest. 34.* calls him the fountain of *Arianism*, but without any cause. The Heresie of *Arius* for which he is most infamous in Ecclesiastical History, is the denying of Christs Divinity. He granted that Christ had a being before he was born of the Virgin *Mary*; but withal said, he was created by God, *ἐκ τῶν μηδ' ὄντων*, so as there was a time in which it might have been said *ἐκ τῶν ὄντων* he was not. That *Origen* ever held any such opinion, I am not convinced. Certain I am, that in the Homilies ascribed to him, I have observed most clear passages for the Deity of our Lord Jesus. In his Books against *Celsus* he most strenuously defends his Divinity against that Sophister.

But are there not other places in his Writings in which he makes Christ *ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπων*, a man,

and no more than a man? *Ans.* So say some of the Ancients; as also the wretched *Transylvanian* Ministers in their Books concerning the original and progress of the Trinity; on which account they call him the most learned of the Fathers. But when we have given him as many grains of allowance as must in charity be given to one who writ much, and in great haste, and whose Writings have fallen into false hands, and by them been transmitted to us, we need not say that he was an *Arian*, or had any favourable thoughts of *Arianism*. The Vision related by *Bellarmino* will not, I suppose, move any wise man. As for *Thomas Aquinas* who would make *Origen* to be the fountain of *Arianism*, be it on those words *John* 1. *In the beginning was the word*, he saith, *Verbum in divinis metaphorice dicitur*; I must needs say, it is a weak foundation to build so heavy a charge upon. That great School-man doth thus put his 34. question, *Utrum verbum in divinis sit personale?* (an obscure question I wot) he determines it affirmatively; but first brings this as an objection against himself, *Nomina personalia proprie dicuntur in divinis, ut pater & filius, sed verbum metaphorice dicitur in divinis, ut Origenes dicit super Joannem.* A doughty objection, no question, and worthy to have a place in a sum of Divinity. Personal names are used properly in the Mystery of the Trinity; the word, according to *Origen*, is not used properly, but metaphorically, *ergo* it is not a personal name. Because the minor could not be denied, *Origen* must be accounted the fountain of *Arianism*. First, the whole perhaps would be granted

granted by *Durand*, who saith that the title of [*Word*] properly imports something essential and not personal. I think the Scriptures ( which in speaking of this Mystery I would follow ) alway appropriate the title of *Word* to the second person ; but that he is called the *Word* properly and not metaphorically only , I cannot as yet find in Scripture. I believe according to Scripture, that the Father begat the Son, but that he begat him as affected with an act of understanding, not as understanding is common to all the three persons, but as he hath it from himself, is not I hope a necessary Article of Faith ; if it be, I have not all the faith that is necessary to salvation. Nor can I obtain of my self to think, that the Son of God is any otherways called the *Word*, than because he resembleth that either Oral or Mental Word that is formed by us men. And were it not that the general stream of Interpreters carrieth the resemblance to a Mental Word, I should be easily inclined to believe, that as a vocal word serves to disclose the mind of a man, so Christ is called the Word, because he discovereth the Mysterious Will and Counsel of God.

If *Origen* did not lay the foundation of *Arianism*, much less can the *Photinians* ( whom the *Socinians* now follow ) pretend to be his off-spring, for they denied Christ to have any being before he was conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin *Mary*, differing from the *Ebionites* only in this, that they did not hold him to be begotten by *Joseph*, as well as born of *Mary*. *Socinus* against *Unicus* is so ingenuous, as to confess that

that he and his continually dispute against the Fathers that flourished after the *Nicene* Council, and declares plainly, that he did not think any of his party had in their writings asserted, that any of the Writers before the *Nicene* Council, now extant, were of their mind: Yet certainly he knew that the Writings of *Origen* were extant, and therefore was conscious that it was in vain to father his heresies upon him. The truth is, we need not be afraid lest our young Divines should grow *Socinians* by reading the Fathers, or those who profess themselves to be *Socinians*, the great danger is from *Erasmus* and *Grotius* who never professed *Socinianism*; but yet in their Commentaries, especially on the Epistles, do most unhappily, by the various readings which they have, as they pretend, met with, or some plausible explications of their own, endeavour to enervate the places that are brought to prove the Deity of Christ Jesus. One I will here take notice of, *1 Tim. 3. 16. God manifest in the flesh*, is a place brought to prove the Divinity of Christ, and is the more considerable, *ad hominem*, because the word *God* doth occupy the place of the Subject in the proposition. *Smalcius, de Incarnatione Christi, Cap. 18.* acknowledgeth; *omnia exemplaria græca hætenus constanter vocem Dei habent.* And indeed to this day there is not a *Greek* Copy to be found of any good esteem that doth not read *God*. What now do these two learned *Dutchmen* say? *Erasmus* prefers the vulgar *Latin*, which reads *God* instead of *Gods*, and suspects *Gods* was added against the *Arians*. But *Grotius* takes more pains to avoid that reading which



which is so commonly received, *Θεὸς ἰσπαρεσθὲν ἐκ αἰώνος*. *suspectam nobis faciunt hanc lectionem interpretas veteres, Latinus, Syrius, Arabs, & Ambrosius qui omnes legerunt, ὁ ἰσπαρεσθὲν, addit Hincmarus opusculo 55. illud Θεὸς hic positum à Nestorianis:* And after strains his wit to find out a good sense of *ὁ ἰσπαρεσθὲν*, throughout the whole Verse. If this be allowable to forsake the Greek, where the vulgar Latin, Syriack and Arabick differ from it, how shall we know where to fix our feet? And let the Learned judg, whether the Syriack and Arabick Translations that we have in the Polyglott, did read, *ὁ ἰσπαρεσθὲν*: if they did, those who translated them are much to be blamed. It is also untruly suggested, that *Hincmarus* saith, *Θεὸς* was put in by the *Nestorians*: But if *Hincmarus* had so said, *Grotius* might, if he had so pleased, have acquainted his Reader, that *Chrysostom* read *Θεὸς*, who was older than *Nestorius* himself: And he could also have told us, that *Cyril* and *Theodoret* made use of this reading, *Θεὸς ἰσπαρεσθὲν*, against *Nestorius*; and therefore sure neither he nor his followers did first frame this reading, which is so perfectly destructive to their heresie. Another place we bring to prove Christs Deity, is, *Rom. 9. 5. Mirum est (saith Bellarmine Pref. ad libros de Christo) quid non agat Erasmus, quò se non vertat, quid non molietur ut hoc solum de manibus nobis extorqueat. Erasmus* doth indeed take two much pains to make this place useles against the *Arians*; yet which should have asswaged *Bellarmines* wrath, he adds like a good Son of the Church, that if she say we must not inter-

interpret these words, but of the Divinity of Christ, she is to be obeyed. As for *Grotius*, he first tells us, that it is manifest from the *Syriack*, that *Θεός* was wanting in the ancient *Greek* Copies. There is not a *Greek* Copy of any note now extant, in which the word *Θεός* occurs not; and yet if the *Syriack* express it not, then it must be thought it was absent from the ancient *Greek* Copies: what will such an opinion as this lead us to? Secondly, he refers us to *Erasmus*, who hath noted, that the words are read without *Θεός* in the ancient Books of *Cyprian*, as also in *Hilary*; and that *St. Chrysostom* seems to have read so too. But *Erasmus* speaks not of the ancient Books of *Cyprian*, in which, or sundry of which, the word *Deus* is to be found; and *Grotius* could not but know, that those Copies of *Cyprian* must needs be corrupted in which *Deus* is wanting; for no Scripture, but that in which Christ is called God, could serve *Cyprians* turn in that place, as any Reader may discern. *Hilary* left not out the word *Deus*, but his Scribe, as *Erasmus* almost acknowledgeth; and *Hilary*, to be sure, in his Books, *de Trinitate*, citeth this place with the word *Deus*. *Chrysostom*, indeed, doth not expound *Θεός*, nor yet doth he expound *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*; but he reads just as we read. By this we may see how little zeal *Grotius* had for the Divinity of Christ, and what danger they are in, who will take his quotations in his Annotations upon trust.

2. In this number I must needs place the *Papists* properly and strictly so called. A *Papist* strictly and properly so called, is with me not one who holds

holds the most of those doctrines which the present *Romish* Church holds; but he who holds them solely or principally on the account of the present Churches Infallibility: More particularly, I do not say he is a *Papist* who holds *Transubstantiation*, because as he thinks the Scripture teacheth it; but he who therefore believes the Scripture to teach *Transubstantiation*, because the Pope in or out of a Council hath decreed or warranted the same. Should I deny the Popes Infallibility in a cause of faith, I were to a *Trent-Papist* a Heretick, as well as if I denied all the Articles of the faith, because I deny the formal reason upon which all are to be believed. Should I hold the Popes Infallibility as the ground and foundation of my faith, then I were to him a good Catholick, though I were mistaken in many of the things to be believed, because I am upon the true and sure foundation of faith. Now if any one can shew me any whole ancient Church, or any one ancient Doctor of the Church who believed the Article of the Bishop of *Rome's* Infallible Supremacy, and made that the ground of believing all other Articles, I will be his Convert, if he will promise to be my Convert provided I can shew him ancient Doctors and Councils that have either not acknowledged or denied this foundation of the Papal faith. And if we speak of the things believed by *Papists*, the most of them are utterly destitute of all primitive Antiquity.

But there are others in the world generally decried as despisers of the Fathers, who had they but men among them able and willing to search the  
Fathers,

Fathers; might from them say more for themselves, than would easily be answered. Instance :

1. In the *Anabaptists*, or *Antipædobaptists*, (as they had rather be called) some of great esteem among the sons of the Church, have said that the opinion of these men cannot be confuted by Scripture, at least not by Scripture alone. In this they give these men as much as the generality of them desire or care for. But of late one of good learning hath espoused their Cause; and finding it granted by too too many, that Infant-baptism cannot with sufficient evidence be proved from Scripture alone; he enquires what it is that together with Scripture will prove it? Being referred to the Ancients, he there joins issue, and hath so acquitted himself, that for my part if I were not perswaded from Scripture that Infants are to be baptized, I should hardly be brought to be of that perswasion by any thing quoted from the Fathers.

One deservedly dignified in the Church, hath suffered it to be printed as his opinion, *that there is neither precept nor practice in Scripture for Pædobaptism, nor any just evidence for it for about two hundred years after Christ. The first who bears witness to Infant-baptism practised in the Church, is Tertullian; but so, as he expressly dislikes and condemns it as an unwarrantable and irrational custom; and Nazianzen a good while after him dislikes it too, &c. with much more of that nature. Really were I of this learned persons judgment, that there is neither precept nor practice in Scrip-*  
ture

ture for *Padobaptism*, I should much hesitate in the matter: for if there be no precept or example of *Padobaptism* in Scriptures, I ask whether the Church succeeding the Apostles had any reason or authority to take up that custom? if she had, then the present Church also hath authority to take it up, though it had never before been taken up; for the Church hath now the same authority that the Church succeeding the Apostolical times had. It will be said, that the Church succeeding immediately to the Apostles, had better opportunity to know the practice of the Apostles, than the present Church hath. *Ans.* That must needs be granted; and if the Church succeeding the Apostles have given any undoubted testimony that the Apostolical Churches practised Infant-baptism, her testimony cannot be refused; but that that Church hath given any such testimony, is easie to say, but not so easie to prove. Nothing out of *Ignatius*, or *Clemens Romanus*, is produced to such a purpose. The Author of the Questions and Answers to the Orthodox, doth indeed, qu. 56. plainly insinuate, that in his time *τὰ ἑξῆς* were baptized, and gives some account what difference should be in the resurrection, betwixt those who were baptized, and those who were not baptized, and of the reason why the *τὰ ἑξῆς* are accounted worthy of Baptism, viz. the *πίστις τῶν ἀποστόλων*: And were this Author *Justin Martyr*, the testimony were considerable, not to prove that Infant-baptism was practised in the time of the Apostles, but that Infant-baptism was soon practised; but the Author of those Questions and  
 Answers

Answers must needs be some one that lived long after *Justin Martyr*. *Origen* I believe will be found to be the first that speaks of Infant-baptism as an Apostolical tradition, in his Com. on *Rom.* But the *Antipadobaptist* to him and all others may say, It is manifest from the Ancients, that divers children of Christian Parents were not baptized in their infancy, nor till they were come to maturity of judgment; and that it was accounted no *ἵνα*, no bar to their preferment that their Baptism was so long deferred, that they were not before their baptism looked upon as unclean: now if this be so, how cometh it to pass that in a Church professing to follow and reverence Antiquity, they are excommunicated and thrown into prison if they do not bring their children to be baptized. Let any man prove out of Antiquity, that *Nazianzen* and his father were accounted Heathens and Publicans till the Son was baptized, which was not till he was about thirty years old.

2. I hear there are sundry among us here in *England*, that refuse to take an oath, judging any oath unlawful in Gospel-times. The opinion of these men is very pernicious, manifestly tending to perpetuate strifes and contentions, which cannot in our Courts of Judicature be ended but by an oath; and I doubt not at all, but that the opinion may be clearly refuted out of Scripture, where the present Patrons of it especially seek to shelter themselves: but if from the Scriptures we remove their Cause to the Fathers, among them I doubt they will find more friends than adversaries.

versaries. For that an Oath is not, at least in any secular matter, to be required or taken, seems clearly to have been the opinion of *Athanasius*, *Nazianzen*, *Chrysostom*, *Isidore Peleusiota*, *Theophylact*, *Hilary*, *Ambrose*, *Hierom*; and I think, to the Greek Fathers I might have added *Basil*. Artifices I know are used to evade their testimonies, but such as will not hold when they are examined by those who can understand the languages in which those ancient Doctors did write.

3. Men usually exclaim against the *Presbyterians*, as persons who forsake all antiquity to follow *Calvin* who is but of yesterday; and I think, if any of them say that *Calvin* affords a student more light to understand Scripture than most of the Fathers put together, they are not much to be blamed. But I must needs say, that *Presbyterians* is now become a term that I understand not; every Non-conformist who is not Congregational, is in some mens mouths a *Presbyterian*, though he never declared any dislike of *Episcopacy*; yea, though he vehemently protest that his judgment is for *Episcopacy*, even for all and every part of *Primitive Episcopacy*. In Dr. *Heylins* late History of *Presbyterians*, a *Presbyterian* is sometimes one that would have the Lords day observed as a Sabbath, one that thinks election and non-election to be absolute; and if a *Presbyterian* be such a one, sure it would be no difficult task to prove that there were such men in the world long before *Calvins* name was ever heard of. With other men, a *Presbyterian* is the same with the old Non-conformist, and against such a *Presbyterian* it is that Mr.

*Scrivener* seems to have laid his action; but besides that he hath laid his Action *coram non Judice*, I think, that when the merits of the cause come to be examined, he will quickly be *non-suited*: For it will be impossible for him to prove either that such a *Presbyterian* is a Schismatick, or that if he be a Schismatick, his Schism is novel. The old Non-conformist was one that could not think a Bishop to be by Divine institution, an Officer of a superior Order to a *Presbyter*, sole power of Jurisdiction and Ordination was the block he could never get over. In matter of worship, he could not satisfy himself to practise the Ceremonies retained and prescribed in the Church of *England*. That the Ministers ordained in *England* were not true Ministers, or that they might not be submitted to as such, he never thought. He could and did give, and receive the Sacrament, only sometimes he both Preached and Administred the Sacrament in private, to such as were of his own opinion and perswasion. If every such man must be accounted an Arian and a Schismatick, he may comfort himself in this, that he hath many among the Ancients, who if they had lived in these days, must needs have been called by the same name. If such a one decline tryal by the Fathers, it is only because he hath not had the good hap to read the Fathers, or because he foresees the tryal will be too tedious and chargeable, and might sooner be ended, if only Scripture were made the Rule. Mr. *Scrivener* is not sure such a stranger in our *Israel*, as not to know how hard the *Diocesans* are put to it, when the Fathers are brought against them.



them. He can tell, no doubt, who they be that are wont to call St. *Hierom* a discontented *Presbyter*, and St. *Cyprian*, a Popular Bishop. He knows who they be, that have undertaken to ruine *Diocesan Episcopacy* by *Clement* and *Ignatius*. And it is possible he hath heard of those, who did undertake to overthrow our English Hierarchy, by Dr. *Hammonds* dissertations for *Episcopacy*. He knows, that when two were appointed to dispute against Dr. *Preston* in the five points, the Dr. presently divided, and set them at variance betwixt themselves; and cannot chuse but think it very easie for the present Non-conformists, if they were brought to a conference with the Prelatical, to make them do execution one upon another.

To deal a little more closely with Mr. *Scrivener*, he hath in the name of the Church of *England* and his own, laid an action against a' Novel Schism: If the Non-conformists upon summons made, shall think meet to appear to this Action, doubtless they will plead not guilty; they will not confess themselves guilty of causing any new schism, but will averr, that they proceed upon the same Principles, that were laid down by the great instruments of our reformation here in *England*. It will be replied, that they oppugne Bishops, they will rejoyne in the words of Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, *Iren.* p. 385. "That they doubt not to make it evident that  
"the main ground for settling Episcopal Govern-  
"ment in this Nation, was not accounted any pre-  
"tence of Divine right, but the convenience of  
"that form of Church government, to the state  
"and condition of this Church, at the time of its

“Reformation; and that they for their parts were never asked whether Episcopal government was suitable to the condition of this Church when it was at first reformed; but whether it be founded on Divine Right. Now to answer them here, the words of the declaration they are to make must be scanned, and the particulars of those Books they are to assent and consent to must be searched; if from them it do appear, that he who doth without quilllets declare assent and consent, must receive Bishops as an higher order of Officers than Presbyters, and that by Christs institution, how will they be found guilty of Novellism or Schism, unless *Wickliff* and *Cranmer*, &c. be found guilty also? But perhaps it will go harder with them in the matter of Ceremonies. Really it will, and if for these they separate from the Church, I am content they be cast; for certainly it is against the whole rule of charity and humility to break off communion in all Ordinances, because some one Ordinance is administred with some such ceremony as I account inexpedient or unlawful. If any Church make the approving of the expedience or lawfulness of that Ceremony, a necessary condition of my holding communion with her, then she, and not I causeth the Schism. But to speak to the matter in issue. The present Non-conformists are not the first that scrupled the use of the English Ceremonies. Sundry of those who were martyred in Queen *Maries* days would never be brought to use them, most of those who then fled into foreign parts both in their exile, and at their return, either durst not, or did not care to use them.

Some

Some of them for Non-conformity refused preferment, some were turned out of that they had, some took up with very small preferment, where no eye could envy them. I have sometimes thought upon it, who they were, that in Queen *Eliz.* Reign did the Church most service in disputing and writing against the Papists, and I find them to have been such, as either did not conform, or conformed heavily and by halves. I have heard it censured as an error in policy, for a Court not to regard those in a time of peace, whom they were forced to make use of in a time of war. Let Mr. *Scrivener* consider whether the Conformists have strength and number sufficient to look the *Papists* and other adversaries in the face, unless they take in the Non-conformists; if they have not, is it prudence, to be at odds with those that must joyn with them in the day of Battel? If he say they have number and strength enough, let him then consider whether it may not be, that some of them will prove false and treacherous, or at least, make a dishonourable peace.\* I could here shew that sundry of them, who most rigorously pressed conformity in *Q. Elizabeths* days, did in *Q. Maries* days either recant, or play the Nicodemites. But this is a performance that I have no mind to be put upon; how soon some other may put himself upon it I cannot tell.

Here I might with credit enough take my leave of Mr. *Scrivener*; yet because there be two particulars in his Book, that have not in these Papers been accounted for, I will, before I conclude, essay whether the Non conformists cannot be ac-

quitted therefrom. The first is the *Hampton-Court* Conference: The second is the matter of Ruling Elders: About both Mr. *Scrivener* is full of confidence and triumph. If a good account can be given of these, I may think the reproach to be rolled away from the *Nonconformists*; for as for railing-invectives against particular persons, I need only say, *Lord lay them not to his charge.*

*Concerning the Hampton-Court Conference.*

1. I say, we have little reason to believe that it is impartially related: for, 1. We have some ground to think that Dr. *Barlow* who drew up the Relation, did before his death profess himself troubled that he had abused Dr. *Reynolds* and those who were joined with him. This sorrow of the Doctor is I know denied by many, by none more than by Dr. *Heylin* against Mr. *Hickman*: but I have enough to clear Mr. *Hickman* from being the inventor, or feigner of that story; for he had it from Mr. *Noel Sparkes*, a learned and pious Divine, and of the Episcopal persuasion, who died but few years before his Majesties return, by him he was allowed to put it in print, as told him by one who would not on slight grounds either raise or receive a report against a Bishop, viz. Mr. *Henry Jackson*, sometime fellow of *Corpus Christi* Colledg in *Oxford*. That all this is true, Mr. *John Martin*, now a Conforming Minister in the Diocess of *Hereford*, can, and if asked will, I suppose, witness.

2. Dr. *Sparks* though he spake not a word in the Conference, and after it ( if I mistake not ) printed a Book for Uniformity ; yet told his son ( sometimes a Minister in *Buckinghamshire*, and Divinity-Reader in *Magdalen-Colledg* ) That Dr. *Barlow* in summing up that Conference, had very much injured Dr. *Reynolds*, and those other that then appeared in the behalf of the *Millenary* Petitioners. This I had from his kinsman before mentioned.

3. I am also pretty well assured, that upon the first coming out of the Sum of that Conference, Dr. *Reynolds* himself lighting upon one of the Books at a Stationers near *St. Maries Oxford*, was found reading of it ; and being asked by a friend what Book it was he read ? answered, *It was a Book in which he was concerned and wronged*. If any doubt of this, he may ( I suppose ) receive satisfaction about it from Dr. *Henry Wilkinson*, resident at or about *Clapham* near *London*. Yea, I perswade my self, that no man who reads that Conference, can be seriously of opinion that Dr. *Reynolds* argued with no more strength than is by Dr. *Barlow* represented in his Relation.

2. If the Conference should he truly reported, little or no damage could thence accrue to the Nonconformists ; for as is said in the Christian and Modest offer of a most indifferent Conference or Disputation printed Anno 1606. pag. 29, 30. *Most of the persons appointed to speak for the Ministers, were not of their chusing nor nomination, nor of their judgment in the matters then and now in question,*

but of a clean contrary. For being intreated at that time by the Ministers to dispute against these things as simply evil, and such as cannot be yielded unto without sin; they professed unto them, that they were not so perswaded, and therefore could not so do. Being then requested to let his Majesty understand, that some of their brethren were further perswaded touching the unlawfulness of these things, than they themselves were; they refused that also. Lastly, being intreated either to give them in writing their reasons to prove these things indifferent, or to give them an answer in writing to such reasons as they would give them in writing to prove them simply evil; they would do neither the one nor the other.

*Obj.* Will Nonconformists then lose so considerable a person as Dr. Reynolds? and are they content the world should look upon him as no Nonconformist?

*Ans.* No doubt he was one that was loth to be made unuseful in the Church, and loth that others should make themselves unuseful; and therefore when any Minister professing himself dissatisfied with Subscription, came to ask his advice, he would (as I have been credibly informed) desire him to give him the grounds of his dissatisfaction, and if he found them weighty, then he would leave him settled in his Nonconformity; but if he found them not weighty, then he would let him know that those reasons notwithstanding he might conform. As for himself, he was satisfied to do all that was incumbent on him, as President

sident of the Colledg, but thought our Church needed a further Reformation, and that the Ceremonies were unprofitable; and prayed that in a due and orderly manner they might be taken away: yet would not peremptorily say, that a man should lose his Ministry rather than not use them. And of this mind were most of those who had in those times the honour to be called and accounted *Puritans*. And let me here propound it seriously to the consideration of present *Nonconformists*, whether it be not possible for them to be over zealous in pressing others not to conform. Sure I am, that the learned and godly Mr. *Anthony Wotton* did flatly deny to tell Mr. *Will. Brice* still alive, the grounds and reasons of his Non-conformity, telling him, *That he would not in such matters put scruples into those in whom he found none*. And really, may not a Conformist save his own soul, and the souls of those that hear him? may he not keep his eyes open, and yet not have light enough to see the unlawfulness of our Ceremonies? If so, as doubtless so it is, why should Non-conformists think so ill, as some do, of their conforming brethren? why should they be so restless, till they have made them their proselytes? why may they not acknowledg and rejoyce in their gifts and graces, and yet peaceably persevere in their own Non-conformity, only wiping off the aspersions that are thrown on themselves, and candidly representing their principles, and practices, that so the present and succeeding ages may see, they do not suffer out of humour and fancy; and that they err not (if they be in an error) without authority and reason.

3. If

3. If we should grant that the published Conference were in all things true and impartial, yet have the friends of Episcopacy, and sticklers for conformity, but little reason to boast or triumph. This must be made out by some brief reflections upon the conference.

The first day none of those who desired Reformation, were permitted to be present at the Conference, nor indeed all that were summoned to appear as defenders of the then established doctrine and discipline, but only the Bishops and five Deans; why neither the Dean of *Christ-Church*, nor the Dean of *Worcester*, nor the Dean of *Windsor* were admitted, nor yet Dr. *Field*, nor Dr. *King*, I find no reason assigned; nor will I guess, at so great a distance, what might be the reason: but why none of the Plaintiffs (as they are called) were admitted, His Majesty gave this reason, *That the Bishops might not be confronted by the contrary opponents; and that if any thing should be found meet to be redressed, it might be done without any visible alteration.* I suppose King *James* thought the things he mentioned in that days Conference, were too too liable to exception, and was resolved to take course with his Bishops and their adherents to have some little amendment, that if they should happen to be mentioned in the next days designed Conference, they might answer they had already considered them, and would have no more done or said about them.

The particulars of that Cabal-Conference, are said to be touching the Common-prayer-book,  
Excom-



Excommunication, providing of fit and able Ministers for *Ireland*. How the providing of fit and able Ministers for *Ireland*, could be proper for this days Conference, I understand not. Dr. *Barlow* saith, p. 9. it was referred to a consultation; if so, and that consultation produced any good effect, all good Christians are to rejoyce, for doubtless that Nation then wanted Ministers. But the Millenary Petition pretended to be the occasion of this Conference, toucheth not upon *Ireland*; if any thing was meet to be done about that Church, in this Conference, reason rather required that the Council for *Ireland* and the *Irish* Bishops should have been summoned to debate and conclude concerning that affair. Perhaps the Doctor mistook *Ireland* for *England*, or was willing to have us believe that there was no want of a Learned Ministry here in *England*; but we shall hear more of this in the second days Conference.

As to the Common-prayer Book, the King desired satisfaction about Confirmation, Absolution, Private Baptism.

Confirmation we shall find mentioned in the second days conference, and thither I refer my considerations concerning it.

Absolution, His Majesty said, he had *heard likened to the Popes Pardons*; If any one had informed His Majesty, that Absolution as used, or at least, as prescribed in the Church of *England*, had any thing in it resembling the abominable pardons of the Pope, I know not how he can be excused from bearing false witness against the Liturgy.

gy. The *Millenarian* Petitioners only pray, that the term *Absolution*, might be corrected, which His Majesty was willing to gratifie them in, appointing *Absolution* to be explained by *remission of sins*. There is, that I know, no real difference betwixt those that are called *Presbyterians* and Episcopal Divines about *Absolution*: Both allow a general *Absolution*, and a particular *Absolution*. Dr. Heylin chargeth Bp. Usher, with utterly subverting, as well the Doctrine of the English Church, as her purpose in *absolution*; but from that charge, the Primate is acquitted by his Chaplain Dr. Bernard.

Baptism, King James thought, was not to be administered by private persons, in any case whatsoever; and therefore propounded it to the Bishops, that the words in the Book purporting a permission, and suffering of women and private persons to baptize, might be altered: And here it is pretty, or rather sad, to observe how the Prelates contradicted one another; Whitgift said, 'The administration of Baptism by women or private persons, was not allowed in the practice of our Church, but enquired of by Bishops in their Visitation, and censured, and that the words in the Book did not infer any such meaning, as that they were permitted to Baptize: But the words of the Book being pressed by His Majesty, 'Bp. Babington confessed that the words were doubtful, and might be pressed to such a meaning; but yet it seemed by the contrary practice of the Church (censuring women in this case) that the Compilers of the Book did not so intend them, and

‘and yet propounded them ambiguously, because  
 ‘otherwise, perhaps, the Book would not then  
 ‘have passed in Parliament. But on the contrary,  
 Bp. Bancroft for his part declared, *That the Com-  
 pilers of the Book of Common Prayer, intended not  
 by ambiguous terms to deceive any; but did indeed,  
 by those words, intend a permission of private per-  
 sons to Baptize in case of necessity, as appeared by  
 their letters, some parts whereof he read, declaring  
 that the same was agreeable to the practice of the  
 ancient Church, urging to that purpose, Acts 2.  
 where Three thousand were baptized in one day, a  
 thing which could not possibly, at least probably be  
 done by the Apostles alone, and besides the Apostles,  
 there were then no Bishops nor Priests. He also al-  
 leged Tertullian and Ambrose plain in that point.*  
 The Bishop of Winchester also spake learnedly and  
 earnestly to the same purpose, affirming, *that the de-  
 nyng of private persons to baptize in case of necessity,  
 were to cross all antiquity; and that, it was a rule  
 agreed upon among Divines, That the Minister is  
 not of the essence of the sacrament: But King  
 James persisting in his opinion to have the altera-  
 tion made, saith the Relator, pag. 19. it was not  
 so much stuck at by the Bishops; it seems that to  
 please His Majesty, they did not much stick to  
 have all antiquity crossed, and a Rule among Di-  
 vines over-ruled. Had the Presbyterians in a  
 point of so great moment, shewed themselves so  
 facile, what a noise would have been made?*

But seeing the alteration is made, and Baptism  
 restrained to Ministers, we may now without of-  
 fence, I hope, enquire what is to be said in this  
 con-

controverſie, and whether other Churches do well to allow that, which we ſee not meet to allow.

And firſt, I would know whether Chriſt the confeſſed inſtitutor of Baptiſm, hath any where commanded lay-perſons, in the abſence of thoſe to whom the word of reconciliation is committed, to adminiſter Baptiſm; if he have not, then their not adminiſtring it can be no ſin, becauſe no tranſgreſſion of a Law: And how can we think that the party who dies unbaptized ſhall ſare the worſe, for not having received that which no one was bound to give him? If it be ſaid he hath laid commandment on lay-perſons, where a Miniſter cannot be had, to Baptize; I deſire to ſee where that command is recorded.

2. I demand whether a lay-perſon, male or female do ſin in Baptizing? If ſo, no power on earth can authorize him or her to Baptize. If it be ſaid, there is no ſin in the caſe; then again I demand where is the permiſſion of Chriſt granted to him or her? for certainly that muſt needs be ſin, which is not allowed by Chriſt the author of the Sacrament.

3. How can we in faith expect that any lay-perſon ſhould convey, *rem Sacramenti*, that is, be the Miniſter of Sacramental grace? Is it any where revealed in Scripture that he doth any more than the outward act (which of it ſelf availeth nothing); if it be not, why might we not as good truſt God that he will ſave the ſick child without the outward act, as think and hope he will regard the outward act, when we cannot be aſſured that any more than the outward act is done?

Laſtly,

Lastly, When lay persons are allowed to administer Baptism, who can say to them, *ne plus ultra*, hitherto you have proceeded, but further ye shall not proceed, other parts of the Ministerial function you may not meddle with ?

But it is said that we have great authorities, and the practice of the Universal Church to warrant Baptism by lay persons in case of necessity.

*Ans.* This is confidently affirmed ; but he who will not believe every confident affirmation, may find some of the Ancients either condemning, or not justifying Baptism by lay persons. As for the instance *Acts 2.* of the three thousand baptized in one day ; besides what is said by *K. James*, that the example was extraordinary, and therefore not to be argued from with any security ; we may say further, 1. That there is no consent that at that time there were no more in the Ministerial Function besides the twelve Apostles. Bishop *Bancroft* indeed affirms, that then there were neither Bishops nor Priests besides the Apostles ; but if we should grant him that, there might be Deacons, and according to his principles they might baptize ; no need therefore of flying to lay persons ; it is not improbable that the Seventy Disciples were then present, and who can assure us that they had no ministerial character on them ? 2. The Twelve might if they saw meet Baptize Three thousand in one day. 3. It cannot be proved that all those souls were Baptized in one day : added to the Church they were in one day ; but that they were solemnly entred into the Church by baptism in one day, the Text doth not prove.

Per-

Perhaps not any one that heard the words of *Peter* gladly, was baptized either the same day, or in the same place in which he heard; but all went to some other places where there was much water, and there were baptized; for that they were baptized in the same place where they heard, is not probable, at least not certain.

*Obj. Is it not a rule agreed upon among Divines, That the Minister is not of the essence of a Sacrament?*

*Ans.* The word *Essence* is an ambiguous term, and so acknowledged to be by Philosophers; and it is not worth while to distinguish it, and so return answer to this question, in distinct propositions. King *James* answered, that *the Minister is of the Essence of the right and lawful ministrations of the Sacrament*. Till that answer be overthrown, it will not be safe to commit the administration of Baptism to lay-hands; nor wisdom for any man to doubt concerning the salvation of his child, because he died unbaptized, when he could get none to baptize him whose authority to baptize is not questioned.

*Obj. But will not this bring in rebaptization, so much abhorred by the Church?*

*Ans.* It cannot bring in rebaptization; for if baptism by Laicks be only *nomine tenus* baptism, the baptism that succeeds it, will not be the second, but first baptism, especially if it be administered in the conditional form, *Si non sis baptizatus, &c.*

The

The next point his Majesty propounded to his Bishops, related to excommunication in causes of lesser moment; asking, *Whether the name might not be altered, and yet the same censure be retained?* Or 2dly, *Whether in place of it another Coercion equivalent thereunto, might not be invented and thought of?*

The Relator saith, *This was a thing very easily yielded to of all sides ( and yet there was but one, or at least but two sides there ) because it hath been long and often desired, but could not be obtained of her Majesty, who resolved still to be semper eadem, and to alter nothing which she had once settled,* pag. 19.

I am here at a great loss; for I cannot believe that Queen Elizabeth, so much famed for piety and judgment, was so resolved not to alter any thing she had once settled, as not to yield so much as to the alteration of a name, if she were long and often desired by her Bishops. Nor do I find that her Bishops long and often desired her, that excommunication for lesser matters might not be called Excommunication, or that instead of it some other Coercion equivalent thereunto, might be thought on. Nor do I understand to what end any such thing should be so long and so often desired. What desirableness is there in this; that men for small matters should be excommunicated; but not under the name of Excommunication? or that they should not be excommunicated, but suffer some Coercion equivalent thereunto? Those that fear the Lord, do account no Coercion that man can inflict, equivalent to Excommunication

O

duly

duly pronounced. As for those who do not fear the Lord, if they should chance to be excommunicated for a small matter, they would make but a small matter of Excommunication, or rather count it a privilege to be freed from the trouble of going to the publick assemblies. For such, if they should owe 4*d.* to their Minister, and refuse to pay it, an Attorney may sooner force them to be just, than an Apparitor. All this while I have not touched on the chief ground of my admiration, which is, how it came to pass (if the thing which his Majesty propounded about Excommunication was so easily yielded on all sides) that no alteration ensued thereupon? How comes it to pass that Excommunication, name and thing, passeth upon men in matters of small moment, and no Coercion equivalent thereunto is as yet devised in the room of it?

This is all I have to advertise about the first days Conference.

In the second days Conference, omitting all Prefatory Speeches, I take notice, that Dr. Reynolds reduced all he and his Brethren had to say, to four heads: The first related to doctrine, praying that the doctrine of the Church might be preserved in purity, according to Gods word; and to that end, that the Articles concluded 1562. might be explained in places obscure, and enlarged where some things were defective. Particularly, the Dr. moved something about the 16. the 23. the 25. Articles; and being about to move more, the Bishop of London cut him off, and kneeling down, prayed the King, 'that the ancient Canon



'non might be remembred, *Schismatici non sunt*  
 'audiendi contra *Episcopos*, and that if any of the  
 'four Plaintiffs had subscribed the Communion-  
 'Book, and yet lately exhibited a Petition against  
 'it, they might be removed and not heard, ac-  
 'cording to the Decree of a very ancient Council;  
 'providing, that no man should be admitted to  
 'speak against that whereunto he had formerly  
 'subscribed. 3dly, He put the Dr. and his asso-  
 'ciates in mind, that the King was very clement,  
 'who permitted them to speak contrary to the  
 'Statute of 10 *Eliz.* against the Liturgy and dis-  
 'cipline established. Lastly, He desired to know  
 'the end they aimed at, alledging a place out of  
 'Mr. Cartwright, affirming, that we ought rather  
 'to conform our selves in Orders and Ceremonies,  
 'to the fashion of the *Turks*, than of the *Papists*,  
 'which position he doubted they approved, because  
 'contrary to the Orders of the Universities, they  
 'appeared before His Majesty in *Turky Gowns*,  
 'not in their Scholastical habits sorting to their  
 'degrees.

*Musa mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso,*

*—Tantane animis celestibus ira?*

So much wrath at the first dash? when men are  
 summoned by the King, and bid by him open their  
 grievances, must they as soon almost as they have  
 opened their mouths, be thus schooled and terri-  
 fied? are the Articles of our Religion so sacred,  
 that to propound a doubt about them, is no less  
 a crime than schism? May not a man think that

the Bishop feared he should not be able to answer the Doctor, who took so much care that he might not be put to answer him at all? Is this to shew forth meekness of wisdom?

Let us a little reflect on the particulars of this great *Diocesans* passion.

1. He would have the ancient Canon remembered, *Schismatici contra Episcopos non sunt audiendi*. This Canon might have been kept in store, till Dr. *Reynolds* had been condemned for a Schismatick, or till the Bishops had said something which he contradicted; but seeing it is now brought into the field we may be allowed to view it, and see what metal it is made of. May not a King so much as hear what Schismaticks can say for themselves? Must it be taken for granted, that Bishops are not culpable causes of the Schism that is made in a Church? Such a Canon as this would have done excellent service at the Council of *Trent*.

2. So would the other Canon, *That no man should be admitted to speak against that whereunto he had formerly subscribed*, have done the Popish Bishops excellent service in *Queen Maries* Reign; by it, I suppose, Bishop *Cranmer* and Bishop *Ridleys* mouths might have been quite stopped; for I doubt they had subscribed to something they were to speak against.

3. The Statute 10 *Elizabetha* did not make it penal for any man having leave from the King to propound his objections against the Liturgy or discipline of the Church of *England*.

4. Dr. *Reynolds* his *Turky* Gown was not a Turkish habit, nor was his University habit conformable

formable to the habit of the *Papists*; nor doth any order of the University require, that a Doctor should have on his Doctors habit every time he appears before the King. So that all this passionate harangue of words might have been spared. It may be we may meet with more reason in the answers to what the Doctor moved.

1. He moved the 6th Article; *After we have received the Holy Ghost. we may depart from grace, might be worded so, as that it might not so much as seem to favour the Doctrine of the Saints Apostasie; and that therefore the words neither totally nor finally might be added.*

What replied the Bishop of London to this? why, that too many in these days neglecting holiness of life, presumed too much of persisting in grace, laying all their religion on Predestination, *If I shall be saved, I shall be saved; which he said was contrary to the true doctrine of Predestination, wherein we should argue rather ascendendo, than descendendo; thus, I live in obedience to God, and therefore I trust God hath elected and predestinated me to salvation: not thus, which is the usual course, God hath chosen me to life, therefore though I sin never so grievously, yet I shall not be damned; for whom he loves, he loves to the end.* And then shewed his Majesty the doctrine of England touching Predestination, *We must receive Gods promises, &c.*

But under favour, these words do not contain the doctrine of Predestination, but are only a caution against the abuse of the doctrine of Predestination laid down in the foregoing words. As for

those who did usually argue *descendendo*, I suppose they were only men of wretched and profligate lives, and we must not baulk a truth lest they should stumble at it; or if we must, then must we also forbear to say, God is merciful, and Christ died for sinners, lest men should thence conclude, Therefore I shall be saved, though I live in many sins; for so it is argued usually. Wherefore the Bishop hath shewed no reason why the Doctor's addition might not be made for the comfort of the trembling penitent; and more full and apert confutation of those who assert a total apostasie from grace received. Yet I confess Dr. *Reynolds* needed not to have made this motion, because the seventeenth Article clearly enough asserteth perseverance.

The second thing moved by the Dr. related to the 23d Article, in which it is said, *That it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of preaching or administering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called.* What could Dr. *R.* take exception at in this Article? why, saith the Relator, at those words, *In the Congregation*; as implying a lawfulness for any man whosoever, out of the Congregation, to preach and administer the Sacraments, though he had no lawful call thereunto. He that can think the Doctor argued at this rate, must think he was not the Dr. *Reynolds*, whose praise is in all the Reformed Churches. I should rather conceive the Dr. took exception at the words *in the Congregation*, as not sufficient to express (what was needful to be expressed in all Articles of Religion)

Religion ) that men may not in private preach and administer the Sacraments, though they have no lawful call thereunto. This sure was the Doctors arguing ; but was not to be so propounded, lest it should have been thought necessary to say more for the perfection of the Churches Articles than could well be said. But supposing Dr. R. to have disputed as the Relator hath reported, what was answered to him ? Why, that it was a vain objection, *because by the doctrine and practice of the Church of England, none but a licensed Minister might Preach, nor either publicly or privately administer the Eucharist or the Lords-Supper, pag. 30,* 31. We are not told by whom this was answered, if we had, we might have been apt to think they were not the profoundest men in the world ; for the rejoinder is easie, that the Church of *England* owned another Sacrament besides the Eucharist. Here, *Θεὸς ἀπὸ μὴ χαρῆς*, the King must be brought in to answer for those who were not of one mind to answer for themselves ; and what is he said to have answered ? why, that he had taken order for private baptism with the Bishops already. I ask, had the Doctor a spirit of divination to know what had been ordered in the first days conference ? If he had not, this answer of the Kings proved not the Doctor's objection to be frivolous, but rather handsomely implied it to have some weight in it.

The Doctor being already acquitted of vanity, let us now see what the framers of the Article might mean by inserting the words *in the Congregation*. King Edwards Article was thus worded,

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of publick preaching, or ministring the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called by men who have publick authority given them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lords Vineyard. And the present Article doth not differ, unless it be altered since Mr. Rogers his time. Out of the last clause of the Article I argue thus: Those ought to be judged lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to the work of the Ministry by men who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lords Vineyard. Some not ordained by Bishops have, &c. *ergo*. This syllogism might, if urged, make some work and stir, and therefore I do not so much as form it in words at length. Still I am unsatisfied why the words [*in the Congregation*] are added either in the first or second clause of the Article; but at adventure I am glad they are added, until it be in some publick Record of our Churches doctrine defined what preaching is; for if Reading be Preaching, then I should not be over-forward to subscribe that it is not lawful for Laicks to preach privately.

About Confirmation the Doctor observed (as the Relator tells us, p. 25) a contradiction betwixt the 25<sup>th</sup> Article, and the words used concerning it in the Collect for Confirmation in the Communion-book; and therefore desired that both the contradiction might be considered, and the

the ground of Confirmation examined.

In this we are told, p. 31. was observed a curiosity or malice ; for the Article insinuates, *That the making of Confirmation to be a Sacrament, is a corrupt imitation of the Apostles ; but the Communion book aiming at the right use and proper source thereof, makes it to be according to the Apostles example ; and his Majesty comparing both places, concluded the objection to be a meer cavil.*

Seeing the Article is by all Ministers to be subscribed, I shall be glad if it can be made appear that the meaning is only, that the making of Confirmation to be a Sacrament, is a corrupt following of the Apostles ; but that it seems to insinuate something more, can hardly be denied by any one that reads the whole *syntax*. But the Bishop in the Collect for Confirmation, saith *inter alia, VVe make our humble supplications unto thee for these thy servants, upon whom, after the example of thy holy Apostles, we lay our hands.* In which words I would fain know who are included in the [*we*] ; for I take it, that the Bishop alone lays on hands ; and let no Minister desire to join with him in imposition of hands for confirmation, if he must be supposed to say that he doth it after the example of the holy Apostles ; for that ever the Apostles laid hands on any that had been duly baptized in their infancy, to confirm them, may be sooner said, than firmly proved ; yet if it can be proved that they did, I shall heartily rejoyce ; for the more apostolical Confirmation proves to be, the more easily and chearfully I hope it will be submitted to. This I find, that in the old Litur-

gy no one question was to be propounded to the Confirmand; in the new there is one to be propounded, and it is such a one as may make all ungodly wretches afraid to have it propounded to them: sure I am, without horrible hypocrisy they cannot answer to it affirmatively. But then the new Liturgy hath chopped off two of the Considerations for which, in the old, Confirmation was said to be appointed; the reason whereof, as I cannot certainly tell, so I will not uncertainly conjecture; though I have heard stories about this affair, that startled me.

Bishop *Bayeroff* saith, Confer. p. 32. *That Confirmation was not so much founded upon the places in the Acts of the Apostles, which some of the Fathers had often shewed; but upon Heb. 6. 2. where it is made a part of the Apostles Catechism: In the first days Conference he had said, It was set down and named in express words, Heb. 6. 2. and affirmed it to be an Institution Apostolical, p. 11.*

Here I may, I hope, enquire what the Bishop meant by saying, *Confirmation was not so much founded on the places in the Acts, which some of the Fathers had often shewed.* What doth which relate to? Have some of the Fathers often shewed, that Confirmation is not so much founded upon the places in the *Acts of the Apostles*? If they have, down falls presently much of many of our Episcopal brethrens building concerning Episcopacy, if they have shewn no such thing; I cannot make sense of the Bishop's saying concerning the places in the *Acts*. As for *Heb. 6. 2.* I am willing to think that by laying on of hands there,



there, may be signified Confirmation: but I cannot much blame those who differ from me in expounding that place; for I find Bishop *Usher* referring the laying on of hands, to the ordaining of Ministers; others refer it to that and sundry other things performed by imposition of hands; these would count themselves wronged, if one should say, *That they deny that which is set down and named in express words.*

The Bishop of *Durham* ( I must not forget that ) is related p. 11. to have noted something out of the Gospel of *St. Matthew*, for the imposition of hands upon children. He might out of that Gospel have observed many things concerning Christs laying of hands on the children brought to him. But the difficulty will be, how to make those things pertinent to the laying on of hands upon those who are too big many times to be called little children, and are already baptized, and desire to be orderly admitted to the Lords Supper; and when these are made appear pertinent, then it will be worth consideration, whether the Bishops should not rather say, *We lay on hands in imitation of Christ*, than in imitation of the holy Apostles.

Obj. But all this while the main Controversie about Confirmation is not touched, which relates to the Minister of Confirmation, which Dr. Reynolds and his party would have had in their own hands, whereas none of all the Fathers ever admitted any to confirm, but Bishops alone, as said the Bishops of London and Winchester, p. 34, 35.

*Ans.*

*Ans.* To me this is not the main question, let our Bishops censure those who admit to the Sacrament such as can neither say Lords-Prayer, Belief, Ten Commandments, nor answer the questions in the Common Prayer-Book Catechism, nor are either confirmed or desirous to be confirmed; let also the Bishops themselves ride through their Dioceses, and confirm all that are unconfirmed, and suspend such from the Sacrament as either are unwilling or unmeet to be confirmed, and I persuade my self, the *Presbyters* will not be vexed that so much work is taken off their hands.

As for what His Majesty is made to say, pag. 36. *That it suits neither with the Authority, nor decency of Confirmation, that every ordinary Pastor should do it, and that there was as great reason that none should confirm without licence from the Bishop, as none Preach without his licence.* I doubt the Relator hath both wronged the King and the Bishops cause; The King, for we can scarce conceive he should have such high thoughts of the Authority or decency of confirmation, as to imagine, that either was lessened by being administred by those by whom Baptism is administred. And the Bishops cause also, for it will not serve their turn that *Presbyters* should not confirm without their Licence, as they do not Preach without their Licence, unless it be also made appear that none can be licensed to confirm but themselves. Before I pass from this, I must also advert, *That the Relator makes the King to tax St. Jerome for asserting, that a Bishop is not Divinæ ordinationis; and the Bishop of London to insert, That if he could not*  
*prove*

prove his ordination lawful, out of the Scriptures, he would not be a Bishop four hours. Wherein I observe the policy of the Bishop, who reserved power to himself to continue a Bishop if he could prove his ordination lawful by the Scriptures; he knew well enough that his Ordination might be lawful, and yet a Bishop not be *Divina Ordinationis*. That is lawful by Scripture, which no Scripture Law condemns, or forbids; but he that should say, that every thing not prohibited, is *Divina ordinationis*, would have much a-do to prove that he himself had any meetness to be consecrated a Bishop. I suppose I can prove that it is lawful for me to wear a Beaver; but when I had so proved, should I not be ridiculous, if I should say that a Beaver was *Divina ordinationis*? Besides, if Dr. Reynolds had chanced to gravel the Bishop with an argument about the lawfulness of his Ordination he to keep his Bishoprick; would presently have replied that he was ordained to be a *Presbyter*, but he was only consecrated to be a Bishop, and by that means he might have kept his lands and his credit too.

Let us now proceed with Dr. Reynolds, who is made to say, that the words in the 37th Article, *The Bishop of Rome hath no authority in this land*, be not sufficient unless it were added, *nor ought to have*. It is like the Doctor had observed that the Oath of Supremacy runs to that or the like effect.

And he had never heard, it is as like, that the King and his Council heartily laughed at the framers of that Oath, and therefore scarce expected

pected to be told, that a *Puritan* was a Protestant frightened out of his wits, for propounding that the Article might be as fully worded as the Oath; yet it seems he had the hap to be laughed at for his honest well-meant motion; so the Relator acquaints us, p. 37.

P. 38. The Dr. moved that this proposition, *The intention of the Minister is not of the essence of the Sacrament*, might be added unto the Book of Articles, the rather, because some in England had preached it to be essential. Had it been told him that if he would name those men who so Preached, they should be suspended, till they had recalled so false and uncomfortable an opinion, or that there was enough in the Articles to infer that the intention of the Minister is not essential to the Sacrament, it had been sufficient; but to say that His Majesty utterly disliked this motion for two reasons, and to name but one of the two, and to stuff up that with a story concerning Mr. Craig, was to put the world under a temptation to think too meanly of their King. *It is unfit to thrust every position negative into the Book of Articles, for that would swell the Book into a volume as big as the Bible, and also confound the Reader; therefore I may not insert this short position, the Ministers intention is not of the essence of the Sacrament, into the English Articles.* This is made to be the Kings argument; to which, whether Dr. Reynolds could reply nothing, others may judge.

Here we might also speak of the Nine Articles of *Lambeth*, put into the *Irish* Confession, not long after this Conference, but never put into  
ours,

outs, though it seems the Doctor moved twice they might be put in. For my part I am not sorry they are left out; for some honest men may question the truth of them, and not be able in faith to subscribe them, and so the Church lose the benefit of their parts: As for *Latitudinarians*, they would have subscribed them in a sense of their own devising, though they had thought them false in the sense of the framers and imposers of them; or they would have said, that by subscribing they did not declare the assent of their minds to the truth of the Articles, but only their purpose not to publish their dissent to them, so as to make a disturbance in the Church about them. A Jesuit Papist, and a *Latitudinarian* Protestant will stick at no subscription whatsoever.

As for the Dean of *Paul*, his discourse to vindicate himself, I am not concerned to contradict him in it; but I think he contradicts himself, if Dr. *Barlow* doth him no wrong, p. 41, 42.

The motion made by the Dr. and related p. 43. concerning a Catechism, produced a very considerable addition to the old Catechism, which was all he aimed at in it; also he succeeded in his motion, that a straiter course might be taken for reformation of the general abuse and profanation of the Sabbath day; for that, the Relator saith, found a general and unanimous assent. So that the Bishops then did not think it *Judaism* to call the Lords day Sabbath, nor to provide for its sanctification.

Nor did he miscarry in his motion for a new Translation of the Bible; for not long after the Conference, a new one was published, which hath been

been generally used ever since, to Gods glory, and the Churches edification.

As for his Majesties profession *that he could never yet see a Bible well translated into English, and that the Geneva Translation was the worst of all*; I believe his Majesty repented of it, or else he had not given leave to Dr. Morton to defend the two places in the Geneva Notes, that he took particular exception to.

Dr. Reynolds for conclusion of what concerned doctrine, moved, *That unlawful and seditious books might be suppressed, at least restrained and imparted to a few*. This a man might think would have been entertained with a general assent and consent, but contrariwise, the Bishop of London supposing himself to be principally aimed at, answereth to what he was never accused of, and saith, but without any proof, *That the Book, De Jure Magistratus in subditos, was published by a great disciplinarian, but named him not*; and the King is said to tell the Doctor, that he was a better Colledg-man than Statesman; and by this means no course was taken to prevent such Commentaries both in Philosophy and Divinity as came into England from beyond the Seas to the corrupting and poisoning of young students in the University.

The motion about Pastors resident and learned, pag. 51, 52, 53, is handsomly avoided by the King, with an answer, that he had consulted with his Bishops about that, *whom he found ready and willing to second him in it, &c.* yet all that Kings days, and ever since, the Nation hath groaned under the burden of an unlearned and non-resident

dent Ministry; if the Law of the Land admit of very mean and tolerable sufficiency in any Clerks, why have not the Bishops petitioned that the Law be altered so as to require greater sufficiency? And if the Lay Patrons are to blame, who present very mean men to their Cures; are Ecclesiastical Patrons to be excused, who present Clerks every way as mean?

Now come the Bishop of *London's* motions to be considered, in number Three:

1. That there might be amongst us a praying Ministry; he meant a Ministry that might read the Common-Prayer-Book, to which very little learning indeed would suffice; but I suppose there was then no want of such a Ministry, nor is there now; so that the motion might have been spared.

The Second motion was, that till a sufficient and learned Minister might be placed in every Congregation, godly Homilies might be read, and the number of them encreased. This motion sure was not liked, for unto this day neither is a learned Minister settled in every Congregation, nor the number of Homilies encreased.

His last motion was, that Pulpits might not be made Pasquils, wherein every humorous fellow or discontented, might traduce his superiors.

This the King graciously accepted, and so did the complaining Ministers, as I suppose; for that the Pulpit should be made a Stage is certainly a very lewd custom, but obtains too too much among I know whom.

Proceed we with *Dr. Reynolds* to Subscription,

as to which, we find him only desiring, that Ministers might be put upon it, to subscribe according to the Statutes of the Realm, viz. to the Articles of Religion, and the Kings supremacy; to subscribe otherwise they could not, because among other things, the Common Prayer-Book enjoined the Reading of some Chapters, in which were manifest errors directly repugnant to Scriptures, instancing particularly in *Ecclesiasticus* 48. 10. where the words infer, *That Elias in person was to come before Christ; and if so, Christ is not yet come.*

Now let us take notice of what is answered :

1. Bishop *Bancroft* answers; ' That the most of the objections against the Books of *Apocrypha*, were the old cavils of the *Jews*, renewed by *St. Jerome* in his time, who was the first that gave them the name of *Apocrypha*; which opinion, upon *Ruffinus* his challenge, he, after a sort, disclaimed; the rather, because a general offence was taken at his speeches in that kind.

This, I must needs say, was a politick answer: for first we are told, that not all the objections, but some of the objections against these books, are the old cavils of the *Jews* renewed by *St. Jerome*.

2. We are told, that *St. Jerome* was the first that called these Books Apocryphal; which opinion after a sort he reclaimed upon *Ruffinus* his challenge.

What can any man reply to such an answer? Should one bring an objection against these books, that the *Jews* never would have brought, he would have been told, That not all objections against them, but only some, are *Jewish* cavils: Should



Should one say that *Jerome* disclaimed not his opinion concerning books Apocryphal, he would be told, That he did not indeed disclaim his opinion absolutely; but yet *after a sort* he did; and how far *κατά τινος*, or *after a sort*, may reach, no one can tell: Nor have we the least reference to any place of *Jerome's* Works in which this disclaiming of his opinion is recorded (whether St. *Jerome* disclaimed his opinion, he who hath not St. *Jerome's* Works by him, may find discussed in Dr. *Cosens* his Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture): I say, it cannot be imagined why the *Jews* should less esteem the Apocryphal books than they deserved; they retain the Canonical books of the Old Testament, which make more against them than the Apocrypha. Nor is St. *Jerome* the first who called the Apocryphal books by the name of *Apocrypha*; others before him had given them that name, or one equivalent, as I can make appear. Indeed the Ancients of the Church have so blasted some especially of the Apocryphal Writings, that I cannot but wonder how they came to be read in our Churches. The History of *Susanna* was accounted a Fable even by *Julius Africanus*, contemporary to *Origen*; and yet our newest Calendar appointeth it to be read, as also the story of *Hell* and *Dragon*. There is a common saying in mens mouths, that these books are Canonical, not for the confirming of our faith, but the regulating of our manners; but he who shall make all Apocryphal books a rule for his manners, may chance to set more on his *Doomsday-book* than he will

quickly get off again. As for him who shall make them a rule of Faith, he will undoubtedly become a Heretick.

Dr. Reynolds his instance the Bishops would not meddle with; but the King, who was not in conference to be contradicted, p. 62. is made 1. To argue and demonstrate, That whatsoever Ben Sirach had said, *Ecclus.* 48. 10. of *Elias*, *Elias* had in his own person while he lived, performed, and accomplished. 2. To check Dr. Reynolds for imposing on a man that was dead, a sense never meant by him. 3. To use a pleasant apostrophe to the Lords, *What trow ye makes these men so angry with Ecclesiasticus? By my soul I think he was a Bishop, or else they would never use him so.* 4. Yet after all, to will Dr. Reynolds to note those chapters in the Apocrypha-books that were offensive, and bring them to the Lord Archbishop on *Wednesday* following.

Had the Relator consulted the Kings honour, he had not inserted one of his Jeers managed with an Oath, into a Conference concerning Religion; nor would he, had he regarded his own reputation, have called a sarcasm, in which was an oath, an unnecessary oath, a pleasant apostrophe. To the place it self, I say the *Greek* copies, (*Ecclus.* 48. 10.) much differ among themselves, and as much from the *Latin* Translation; our *English* Translations also greatly vary; but I could never yet meet with any Copy or Translation from which at least an unwary Reader or hearer would not collect that *Elias* was to come before the day of Lord, either first or second. *Junius* saith the place

place argueth the ignorance of the author, blind in the promises concerning the Kingdom of Christ, *Brother* acknowledgeth little less. The *Syriack* and *Arabicke* Translatour carry it clearly for *Jesus* his being to come before the day of the Lord, to turn the hearts of the children to the Parents, as may be seen in the *Polyglotts*. So that if the Doctor was mistaken about the meaning of *Ecclesiasticus*, his mistake was common to him with many more of great esteem, and deserved not to be put off either with a check or a flout. Whether D. R. ever brought in a list of the offensive chapters in the Apocryphal books, I cannot tell; but I can find, that since King *James* his time, the people have had in Parochial Churches less Apocrypha, and more Canonical Scriptures; perhaps at last the divinely inspired Writings that have in and on them so many express signatures of Holiness and Majesty, shall prevail to have the sole honour of being read in the Churches for Christians instruction.

As to the next scruple about subscription, grounded on, *Jesus said to his disciples*, when he spake to the Pharisees; it seems the King took order to have the Translation reformed.

Now must Dr. *Reynolds* for a season give way to Mr. *Knowstubb* a *Cantabrigian*, and a very eminent Divine, though not much known by any writings he left behind him. He is said by Dr. *Burton* to have objected against the Interrogatories in Baptism propounded to Infants; but what it was he said against propounding those Interrogatories to the Infants, we are not told; but rather made

believe his discourse was so perplex, that the King professed he understood it not. The Bishop of *Winton* aiming at his meaning, shewed the use of such Interrogatories out of *St. Austin*, adding his reason, *Qui peccavit in altero, credat in altero*. Glad am I to find that one *English* Bishop, without contradiction from any other joined with him, did allow *St. Austin's* saying that an Infant may *peccare in altero*; I hope if any now laugh at the notion of our sinning in *Adam*, they will acknowledge themselves to have embraced an opinion quite different from the opinion of those to whom they succeed. In the meantime I shall be glad to hear it proved, that a child can *credere in altero*; for I rather opine, that a Parents Faith is, so far accepted by God, as to entitle his child to Baptism, than that the child of a believer doth believe in his believing father: for if he believe in him, he must be saved in him, if he dye in his Infant-state; and I would give all I am worth to hear it proved, that all the Infants of godly Parents dying in their Infancy, are saved. But of this no more. Our new Liturgy hath almost taken away the ground of the dispute concerning these Interrogatories; for it ordereth that the first Interrogatory should be thus propounded: *Dost thou in the name of this child, &c.* which words I have not observed in the old Liturgy. But yet I would fain know why we may not as well ask the Father, *Wilt thou that this child be baptized in this faith?*

Pass we from the Interrogatories, to the cross in Baptism, which *Mr. Knewstappe* took exceptions to, in number two: First, the offence of weak brethren,

brethren, grounded on the words of St. Paul, *Rom. 14.* and *1 Cor. 8. viz.* the consciences of the weak are not to be offended. These places being the chief seat of the doctrine of scandal, deserve a most serious consideration; for certainly we should take heed not to destroy those for whom Christ died.

And this care is principally to be taken by the Church in making Canons; if she only command things which Christ hath commanded, who is he that can blame her, or think she exceeds the bounds and limits of the power given her? but if she command that which she confesseth she need not command, and which she cannot but know many account unlawful; and if she command such a thing under the highest penalty; then hath she reason to consider whether such precepts will be pleasing to her Lord? It will signifie little to ask how long people will be weak? for no doubt they will be weak while the world stands. As little will it signifie to say, Subscriptions are not required of Laicks and Ideots, but Preachers and Ministers; for it is notorious that Subscriptions are required of Fresh-men at their matriculation in the University, when to be sure they are Laicks, and not acquainted with Controversies in Religion. As for Ministers, they should not be weak in faith, but they must consider that they have under them such as are weak; and not suddenly engage never to administer necessary Ordinances unto them, unless they will receive them with disputable Ceremonies. If a single Minister were left to his own choice either to cross the child he baptizeth, or not to cross it, ought he not to say, If by crossing I shall scanda-

lize my brother, I will not cross a child while the world stands. It will be said, that a single Minister is not left at his liberty. True; but the Church was at liberty to make or not to make a Law about crossing. Had she made no Law to cross children that are baptized, then I suppose no Minister would have crossed any child; and what damage the child would have sustained by not being crossed, it is past my skill to imagine; by making a Law that all children that shall be baptized publicly, shall be also crossed, many learned Ministers are put out of Livings, many are made to lay aside the thoughts of being Ministers, and divert to Law or Physick, a bone of contention is cast among the common people, &c. What ought the Church to do in this case?

Mr. Knowstubs's second Argument is said to have consisted of three interrogatories:

I would ask one question that was not then by him asked, viz. *Whether it will be as profitable for the Child to be signet with any other sign, as with the sign of that Cross upon which our Saviour did suffer death?* If it will not (as no doubt, most will say it will not) then we must be first informed what figure our Saviours Cross was of, lest in going about to make the sign of it, we should make the sign of somewhat else. And how shall we know what figure our Saviours Cross was of? The *New Testament* will afford us little light in this matter; for the word *crux*, though affirmed by a great Critick, first to signify the same with *Fors*, then with *Crux*, yet is known by those who have observed its use in *Hebrew* and other Authors,

to have no other original signification than of a Stake. If we betake our selves to the Fathers, they speak strangely and variously concerning the figure of the Cross: *Origen* and *Jerome* say, that the Samaritan letter *Tau* represents the figure of a Cross, than which saith *Staliger* nothing is more false; nothing more true, saith *Dr. Walton* in his *Prolegomena*; yet the character of the Samaritan *Tau*, now in use, hath no resemblance with a Cross, what character it may have in old medals and monies, sober men will not much regard. *Justin Martyr*, dealing with *Trypho* the Jew, will find figures and types of the Cross in the *Old Testament*, where the Spirit never intended any. Yea, in his second *Apology* for Christians, he bids the Heathens consider, whether without this figure, men could administer any thing, or have any converse with one another. The Unicorn's horn, as he describes it, doth indeed fairly represent such a kind of Cross, as it is most probable our Saviour suffered on, for that seemeth to have been made of a piece of wood fixed in the earth, with a transverse beam fastned unto it towards the top, and another piece of wood infixed into, and standing out from that which was erected and straight up; but that *Ades* thought of any such thing when he blessed *Joseph*, *Deut.* 33. 17. or that the *Psalms* aimed at any such thing, *Psal.* 22. 21. is so improbable, that it is well we have other types and prophecies of the *Old Testament*, to produce against the Jews, to whom a crucified Christ is a stumbling block. But now, which of our Deacons or Priests doth, in crossing a Child, represent the five extremities

of

of the *Roman* Cross? The aforesaid *Iustin Martyr* in his *Apology* suggests, that *Philo* having read the story in *Moses* concerning the Brazen Serpent, and not understanding that it was the sign of a Cross which he made, but rather a decussation, said, τὸ μυστὶ τοῦ περὶ τὸν Θεὸν δυνάμει καὶ χρίσθαι ἐν τῷ πᾶσι. Yet I believe it were no hard matter to find some Christian Writers that make the *Roman* X to be the Cross, and that is *crux decussata*, or an *Andrews* Cross, as I think we were taught to call it when we learnt *Arithmetick*. To be brief, I think that if Christ had intended his Picture should have been set up in Churches, he would have left us some sure way to know his visage.

2. If he had designed the Cross on which he suffered, any honour, he would have taken care that it should be preserved. 3. If he had ordained to teach his Church by the sign of the Cross, he would have left us at no uncertainty how to make it. As for the visage of our Saviour, that that is unknown, I would fain think that no man now doubts. For though it be reported by *Damascent* and *Evagrius*, that our Saviour sent his Picture unto *Abgarus* Prince of *Edessa*; yet it is by them reported on the credit of they tell us they know not whom, and neither of them describe what a kind of man he was: Besides *Eusebius* who wrote the story of matters supposed to pass betwixt Christ and *Abgarus* out of the Records of *Edessa*, hath not one word of this Picture. Of another image of our Saviour made by *Nicodemus*, mention is made in a piece attributed to *Athanasius*, but falsely, as the more ingenuous *Papists* acknowledg. *Nicephorus*



*Nicephorus Calistus* also, *Lib. 10. cap. ult.* hath given us a very particular account of Christs face and body, as to figure and form. *James Nasier*, as I have been told, when brought to give an account of his blasphemy in making himself Christ, had, as near as he could, made himself to look like such a man as *Nicephorus* hath described; but as I suppose that no man in his wits took that blasphemer to be Christ, so no man that hath much wisdom will believe, that *Nicephorus*, at above a Thousand years distance, is to be much credited concerning our Saviours feature and complexion, especially, till he have named the authors whom he follows. The Cross of Christ, we are told, was found by *Helena* the Mother of *Constantine* the Great, Three hundred years after his sufferings; but the Story appeareth to have little probability in it. We must suppose that there were in that place just Three Crosses and no more, and that by a miracle those Three Crosses were preserved from putrefaction; now if any man can think that our Saviours Cross was so miraculously preserved, yet to what end should the two Thieves Crosses be preserved, unless it were to trouble and perplex those, who should be so simple as to look after that which was nowhere to be found? But how did the seekers after this Cross, distinguish it from the Crosses of the two Thieves? were the Crosses only found, and not the Titles signifying what the crime was for which they were crucified? *St. Ambrose* saith the title was found; yet *Queen Helen* not trusting to that, by the counsel of the Bishop of *Jerusalem* expects a miracle, applies the Crosses of the

two Thieves to a dead man taken out of the *Bier*, but they put no life into him, which the Cross of Christ, as soon as it touched him, presently did; others say, that the Cross at that time did not restore a dead man to life, but only recovered a *Jerusalem* woman that lay sick of a very desperate disease: and *Sozomen*, as I take it, reports it to have wrought both these miracles at one time. O! how little sound knowledg was then in the world, when Christians of prime note took such pains to find out that which no way cooperated to our redemption, but was only a passive instrument of our Saviours sufferings materially considered? Is that Cross of wood, if it could now be found, a meet object of religious, or so much as civil honour? What use could it be of, unless there should appear something in the make of it, that would serve to illustrate some form of speech in sacred or prophane Authors? As for stirring up of sorrow, the Word and Sacraments are much more apt to do that than any sight of the Cross on which our Saviour did hang. But great miracles have been wrought by the Cross, and fragments or pieces of it, yea, by the sign of it. I must not deny but that many things very wonderful are reported to be done by the Cross. But perhaps sometimes these wonders were wrought by the Devil, to deceive inordinate worshippers of such images, God permitting, and the indelity of men necessarily requiring it, that I may make use of *Biels* words. 2. If God at any time did do a miracle, the Cross it self being applied, or the sign of it made, it must be the Faith and Prayer of the person using the Cross, that God

respected in putting forth his power, and not the Cross. 3. I do much doubt that the one half of those things which are reported to be done by the Cross, were never done at all. The highest story that ever I read concerning the effects of the Cross, and which is made use of by almost every Popish Writer in this matter, is the delivering of *Julian* the Apostate from the spirits, with which he was frightened, upon the making the sign of the Cross, though he had before renounced it. Such a thing I find indeed in *Nazianzen's* first invective against *Julian*. But the Father reports it only on hearsay, λέγεται ὑπὸ πλείονων, but I would fain know how the report was first raised, none pretended (that we find) to have had it either from *Julian* himself, or from the Conjuror that was with him; yet if men had it not from them, they must needs feign it themselves. The same Father had before told us, that when *Julian* was sacrificing, the intrails of the Beast shewed him a crowned Cross; but he prefaceth that Story thus, τὸ δὲ ἐν ἀσχυμῶν, closeth it thus, ἐν μὲν λευδῆς, ἀφ' αὐτοῦ οἴοντο, ἐν δὲ ἀλνδῆς, &c. by which it may appear, that this Father did not stick to put into his writings, such stories as he would not averr to be true, when he conceived they might serve his turn. Had all that have reported as strange matters concerning the Cross, been so ingenuous, as to let us know that they went but upon common fame, Stanrolatry had not proceeded to such an height as it hath now attained in the *Romish* Church. But let us now consider Mr. *Knewstubb's* questions:

1. Whe-

1. Whether the Church had power to institute an external significant sign?

For answer, it might have been expected that the Churches charter to institute such significant signs should have been produced and read to the Questionist; but instead of doing so, it was replied to him:

1. That he did mistake the use of the cross with us, which was not used in Baptism any otherwise than only as a ceremony. Which was a pretty reply indeed, and implieth that a ceremony cannot be an external significant sign, or else was a most insignificant answer.

2. That they themselves made imposition of hands in their ordination of Pastors, to be a sign significant. Which Reply supposeth, 1. That they ordained Pastors (the which I never heard they did.) 2. That there is the same reason of a ceremony used, and perhaps commanded by the Apostles, that there is of ceremonies never used nor commanded by them.

3. 'The kneeling on the ground, the lifting up our hands, the knocking of our breasts, are ceremonies significant, and yet are and may lawfully be used, said the Bishop of *Winchester*. But he might as well have held his peace; for though these be significant ceremonies, yet they are not of that class of significant ceremonies which *Nonconformists* scruple; for the scrupled ceremonies are such as have humane institution, ordained signification, mystical signification, appropriation to Gods solemn Worship and Service. And the ceremonies the Bishop instanced in, though lawful, are none of them

them commanded by the Church, nor will be (I suppose) in haste.

4. 'Dr. *Montague* Dean of the Chappel, remembered the practice of the *Jews*, who unto the Institution of the Passover prescribed unto them by *Moses*, had, as the *Rabbins* witness, added both signs and words, eating sower herbs, and drinking wine, with these words to both, *Take, eat these in remembrance, drink this in remembrance;* upon which addition and tradition of theirs, our Saviour instituted the Sacrament of the last Supper, in celebrating it with the same words, and after the same manner; thereby approving that fact of theirs in particular, and generally that a Church may institute and retain a significant sign. Which satisfied his Majesty exceeding well.

Here is a foundation laid, and then a superstructure raised on it. The foundation is, that the *Jews* unto the institution of the Passover prescribed unto them by *Moses*, had added both signs and words, &c. but is not this foundation laid in the sand, depending on the testimony of later *Rabbins*, whose testimonies are by wise men esteemed lighter than vanity? The apostate *Jews* were no doubt grown wretchedly superstitious; but I am loth to believe, unless I needs must, that they used all the fopperies their *Rabbins* mention as in use with them. But be this as it will, I wonder what made the Reverend Dean say, that the eating of sower herbs was an addition to the Paschal Institution; sower herbs were as much commanded as unleavened bread. The *Jews* had indeed of their own heads added to the Paschal provisions a dish of  
thick

thick sauce made of Dates, Figs, Raisins and Vinegar mingled together (as some Authors say) to put them in mind of the clay in which their fathers laboured.

Allowing them to have used this sauce and wine, and whatever else superstition could dictate to them, how appears it, that upon any addition or tradition of theirs Christ instituted his Sacrament? or that he had not instituted the supper before the Jews made these additions? If we look upon Christ in the days of his abode here on earth, we find him to have shewed no great respect to the traditions and ceremonies of the Jews that had no Divine institution, as may be made appear by many instances, if it were worth while; so far was he from allowing his Churches to add any thing to his own institutions that nature did not call for.

We are told by the Relator, p. 68. That here the King desired to be acquainted how ancient the use of the Cross was. Dr. Reynolds confessed it to have been ever since the Apostles times (mark, he did not confess it to have been used in the Apostles times, nor did the Bishops or any of their adherents say it was used by them), but the difficulty was, whether it were of that ancient use in Baptism? To remove this difficulty, the Dean of Westminster produceth Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, saying it was in use in *immortalis levitro*. The Bp. of Winchester added, it was in use in *Constantinus* time, pag. 69. whereupon the King concluded, *If then it were used, I see no reason, but it may still be retained.*

As for the antiquity of signing with the sign of the

the  
ply  
Cre  
Chu  
If v  
upo  
the  
sing  
tism  
our  
spar  
leav  
am  
hol  
exp  
pest  
a p  
the  
reig  
sign  
Kin  
we  
of  
the  
wre  
anc  
or  
not  
nal  
pro  
rise  
the  
Ba

the Cross in Baptism, the *Nonconformists* may reply, That it was as ancient to use the sign of the Cross when people went abroad, or entred into the Church, or prayed, as when a child was baptized. If we may leave off the frequent use of crossing upon other occasions, without any dishonour to the Fathers, why may we not also leave off crossing in Baptism? Anointing also was used in Baptism by the Fathers; yet it is accounted a piece of our Reformation not to use anointing; what disparagement to the Reformation would it be to leave off crossing also? Besides, there was an use among the Fathers of the sign of the cross, which holds not for our times; and sundry effects they expected from it, which we cannot, dare not expect from it, because we cannot find in Gods word a promise that any such effect shall follow upon the crossing our selves. All along *Queen Elizabeths* reign it was customary for the Queen to apply the sign of the cross to the tumour of the *Strumosi*; *King James* discontinued that ceremony; and yet we do not find that he had less success in the curing of the *strumous* disease, than the Queen. So that the strange and wonderful things pretended to be wrought by the sign of the Cross in the days of our ancient Doctors, were either not wrought at all, or if they were wrought, the sign of the Cross nothing contributed to the working of them. Finally, I marvel why the Dean of *Westminster*, to prove the antiquity of the Cross in Baptism, did rise no higher than *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Origen*; they are not the ancientest Fathers that speak of Baptism; the two first ercted in the very point of

Q

Bap-

Baptism; the last ( if his Translators have not abused him ) was scarce found in any thing.

But the Cross was used in *Constantine's* times; and why may it not now be used? shall we accuse *Constantine* of Popery and Superstition? Thus is the King said to have argued in the Conference; and by his argument he gave us to understand, that he liked not that any one should charge *Constantine* with *Popery* or Superstition; I therefore will lay neither to his charge; but yet his purpose not to be baptized till he might be baptized in the same River where Christ was baptized, viz. *Jordan*, if it did not proceed from superstition, proceeded from a very odd humour. God crossed him in that his design, and put him under a necessity either to receive Baptism in another place than *Jordan*, or not to receive it at all. ( In this I follow *Eusebius*, for whom should I rather follow than him who so well knew *Constantine*, and hath transmitted his History to posterity? If any man incline to those who would have *Constantine* baptized many years before at *Rome*, I leave him to *Scultetus* in his *Medulla*, who defends *Eusebius* against *Baronius*.)

Mr. *Knewstubb's* second question was, supposing the Church had power to add significant ceremonies, whether she might there add them where Christ had already ordained one? Which he supposed was no less derogatory to Christ's Institution, than if any Potentate of the Land should presume to add his Seal to the Great Seal of *England*.



To this Dr. Barlow saith, p. 70. the King answered, *That the case was not alike; for that no sign or thing was added to the Sacrament which was fully and perfectly finished, before any mention of the Cross is made.*

I dare not think this was King James his answer: for it is only fitted and suited to our own Church as then it was ordered, and still continues. In the first Book of King Edward, crossing was appointed before Baptism could be pretended to be perfected, or indeed begun; which was also the usage of the ancient Churches. 2. I conceive the presumption of any subject would be great, if he should add his own seal to confirm or signifie any thing that the King's Great Seal was appointed to confirm and signifie, though the Great Seal had been set before he set his Seal. 3. Methinks the argument stands still in its full force; If applying of water to a believer in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, do signifie all that the Cross signifies, to what end is the Cross used? The child that is baptized with us, is obliged by Baptism obediently to keep Gods holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of his life; what can the Cross oblige him to more? Is not confessing the faith of Christ crucified, one of Gods commandments? I know a learned man hath replied, that constancy is not distinctly signified in being baptized, as it is in being crossed. But I ask, Is it any benefit to a man to have some ceremony used that doth more distinctly mind him of his constancy than Baptism did? If it be none, then such a ceremony is need-

less; if it be some benefit, how came it to pass that no Apostle ever used any such ceremony? and why do we not excogitate other ceremonies to admonish us as distinctly of other duties?

Mr. *Knewstubb*'s third question was, In case the Church had power to institute such a sign, how far such an Ordinance was to bind them without impeaching their Christian liberty?

The King charged him never more to speak to that point. And therefore I will not speak to it at all, but must needs say it was an odd question if it were so propounded as the Relator hath worded it.

Dr. *Reynolds* is again brought on the stage, p. 71. objecting the example of the Brazen Serpent stamp'd to powder, because the people abused it to Idolatry; wishing the Cross, because superstitiously abused, might be abandoned also.

To this the King is made to say, 1. If it were abused to Superstition in the time of Popery, that plainly implies, that it was well used before Popery. As if nothing had been abused by the Papists in Divine Worship, but what had been once well used. 2. That there is no resemblance between the Brazen Serpent, a material visible thing, and the sign of the Cross made in the air. As if a thing made in the air, might not be abused to superstition as well as a material visible thing. 3. That the Papists themselves did never ascribe any

any power or spiritual grace to the sign of the Cross in Baptism. Whether they did or no, their Writings will best testifie. 4. The material Crof-fes, which in time of Popery were made for men to fall down before them, to worship, are removed, as they desired. Whereas most present at the Conference knew that in many places they were not removed.

The next thing objected, was the wearing of a Surplice, a kind of Garment which the Priests of *Isis* used to wear.

To which His Majesty answered *inter alia*, That if Heathens were commorant among us, so as they might take occasion to be strengthened or confirmed in *Paganism*, then there were just cause to suppress the wearing of it. A notable answer, and which the *Nonconformists* may do well to treasure up, as like to stand them in good stead in these controversies.

*With my body I thee worship*, is an old and odd phrase; and if it may not be altered, it must be explained, and then *Mumpsimus* may do as well as *Sumpsimus*.

The Ring in Marriage Dr. *Reynolds* approved, and the corner'd cap. Committing of Ecclesiastical censures unto Lay-chancellors, the King promised to take order to reform, p. 78. And Archbishop *Grindal's* prophesyings it is like enough His Majesty would not have disliked, if he had not misunderstood the design of them.

And

And now I would fain know whether what the Bishops got by this Conference, may not be put in a mans eye, and he never see the worse. Dr. *Reynolds* got a great deal by it, viz. a new Translation of the Bible, such an explication of the use of the Cross, as (if the story be true) he did acquiesce in; a large addition concerning the Sacraments in the Church-catechism, &c. so that Dr. *Heylin* in his History of *Presbyterians*, quarrels with King *James* for giving any way to the Conference.

There is but one thing more I will concern my self to take notice of in Mr. *Scrivener's* Action against the New Schism; he desires to have one place in which *Presbyter* signifies a Lay-man. Though I think I could satisfie his desire in this, yet I find not my self on any account obliged so to do; for the *English Nonconformists* are not over-fond of Ruling-Elders; those Churches that retain such Officers, will not acknowledg them to be lay-men; nor indeed have they any reason to acknowledg them to be such. For why should Church-officers chosen by the Church, and commended to the grace of God by prayer, be called laicks? because they labour at some employment to keep themselves from being chargeable to the congregation? why then the Apostle *Paul* was for some part of his time a Laick, for he laboured. And in later times I could instance in men that for their Learning and Piety deserved to be Metropolitans, who yet were fain to preach and work.

It were to be wished, that many in *England* to whom the care of souls is committed, were permitted

mitted and enjoyned to follow some calling in the week-days, for by that means they would be less scandalous than now they are. Why should men that know not what it is to study, be forbidden to dig?

Are they Laicks, because they do not preach? Many we have in *England* who would think scorn to be termed Laicks, that never did preach, never had licence to preach.

Are they Laicks because they are not ordained by laying on of hands? It will be hard to prove that that ceremony is essential to make a man a Church-officer.

But yet Mr. *Scrivener* hath good leave to fall upon these Ruling-Elders, to bring them into any Court by a *Quo VVarranto*; and if he do chance to cast them, there be but few *Nonconformists* that will be at cost to bring the business to a new Trial. These Elders in some places are made the more pert, because of the multiplicity and variety of answers that the Prelatical give to those places of Scripture on which their divine institution is pretended to be built. It would tire an ordinary patience to reckon up the various expositions that are given of 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *Scultetus* censures the answers given by *Bilson*, another condemns the answer given by *Scultetus*; others confute all the answers given by Mr. *Mede*. Among all that have written against Elders, whether unlearned or learned, I have not met with any that have satisfied me (yet I can satisfy my self) about this place. For those Churches that argue heartily for these Elders, do argue from the general  
word

word *πρεσβύτεροι*, from the two participles *προσβύ-  
ται*, and *πρωτεύει*, from the two articles  
*οἱ*, *οἱ*, from the two species or kinds of Elders,  
from the two participles, two articles, two special  
Elders divided and separated *διακριτικῶς* by the  
discretive particle *μήλιστα*. Let Mr. *Scrivener*  
face this argument with some of the old answers,  
and see what will come on it. And let him take  
heed how he strikes at these Lay-Elders, as he will  
call them, lest he wounds those among us known  
by the name of Lay-chancellors. In the mean  
time I beseech him to commune with his own  
heart, and to consider with what spirit he writ  
his books against *Dailge* and the *English Non-  
conformists*; by so doing he will be brought, I  
doubt not, to take shame unto himself, and so  
prevent the far greater shame of having his rail-  
ings and calumnies laid open by others. *Quod erat  
exorandum.*

icles  
ers,  
ecial  
the  
ener  
vers,  
take  
will  
own  
nean  
own  
writ  
Non-  
t, I  
d fo  
rail-  
erat